DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 103 967 EA 006 890

AUTHOR	Booth, Ronald R.
TITLE	Status of Collective Bargaining in Illinois Schools, 1973-74: The Implications for Management. Research Report No. 302.2.9.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Association of School Boards, Springfield.f
REPORT NO	RR-302-2-9
PUB DATE	May 74
NOTE	83p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Illinois Association of School Boards, 330 Iles Park Place, Springfield, Illinois 62718 ($5.00, Quantity discounts, Payment must accompany order)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Collective Bargaining; *Collective Negotiation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Employer Employee Relationship; Fringe Benefits; Grievance Procedures; Health Insurance; *Negotiation Agreements; Negotiation Impasses; Salaries; School Districts; *State Surveys; Tables (Data); Unions; Wages
IDENTIFIERS	Illinois Association of School Boards

ABSTRACT

Comparing bargaining and nonbargaining Illinois school districts, this survey presents computer organized data in eight categories: characteristics of the responding districts, board-teacher relationships, economic benefits for teachers, language, procedures, Illinois Association of School Boards services, the future, and priorities for collective bargaining programs and services. Discussion in each section deals with area comparisons and State totals. The data reveal that nonbargaining districts have a greater range of policy involvement but that bargaining districts have slightly higher salaries, greater fringe benefits, and more help from State organizations. The concluding discussion examines the implications of collective bargaining for public policy and school management in Illinois. (Author/DW)

ED103967

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

IASB

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

STATUS OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN ILLINOIS SCHOOLS, 1973-74: The Implications for Management

research report no. 302.2.9

Copyright © 1974 by the

ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL BOARDS
330 Iles Park Place
Springfield, Illinois 62718
217-528-9688

Ronald R. Booth
Director of Management Information

May, 1974

EA 006 890

Price: Single copies to non-members, $5.00; to members, $4.00. Three to five copies per order, 10 percent discount; six to ten copies per order, 15 percent discount; eleven or more copies, 20 percent discount. See last page.

HIGHLIGHTS OF STUDY RESULTS

- Teachers in districts that do not bargain formally are more likely to take part in discussions with management on an unlimited range of policy matters than are their counterparts in districts that do bargain formally.

- The major beneficiaries of a mandatory bargaining law will be the Illinois Education Association and the various organizations and firms that provide services to school management.

- The salaries of teachers in bargaining districts are not significantly better than salaries of teachers in nonbargaining districts, but they do enjoy slightly better fringe benefits.

- Three-fourths of the responding districts report teacher organization membership levels above 50 percent. The remaining one-fourth are small districts clustered in certain geographical areas.

- Among districts with signed agreements with their teachers, 93 percent report their teachers are getting help from the state organizations. Among districts without signed agreements, 73 percent report state organization involvement.

- Once a mandatory bargaining law is passed, it appears likely that the Illinois Federation of Teachers (IFT) will quickly become frozen in the number of its local affiliates. Those areas of the state where little bargaining is now going on will fall to the Illinois Education Association (IEA), for it already has significant membership and organizational strength even in those areas. One might reasonably speculate that, within three to five years, the IEA will absorb the IFT, Chicago and all.

- Nonbargaining districts tend to underestimate the costs involved in formal bargaining.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 4

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 5

THE SURVEY 6

1. CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDING DISTRICTS
   Analysis 8
   Tables 11

2. BOARD-TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS
   Analysis 16
   Tables 18

3. ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR TEACHERS
   Analysis 21
   Tables 24

4. LANGUAGE
   Analysis 30
   Tables 33

5. PROCEDURES
   Analysis 45
   Tables 48

6. EVALUATION OF IASB SERVICES
   Analysis 54
   Tables 55

7. THE FUTURE
   Analysis 60
   Tables 63

8. PRIORITIES FOR PROGRAMS AND SERVICES
   Analysis 71
   Tables 74

IMPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC POLICY AND SCHOOL MANAGEMENT 80

INTRODUCTION

What would be the impact of a mandatory collective bargaining law on Illinois school districts? What services would districts need and what might they reasonably expect from the Illinois Association of School Boards? What is happening in bargaining districts in terms of procedures, scope of negotiations, and results? What are non-bargaining districts doing--if anything--in lieu of collective bargaining?

These were just a few of the many questions that prompted IASB to conduct a comprehensive survey of its 936 member school districts in the fall of 1973. The questionnaire designed for this survey, and the results presented in this report, hopefully will provide the basis for a continuing series of annual studies. The eventual longitudinal data--comparing results before and after enactment of bargaining legislation--should provide some invaluable insights into the impact of bargaining.

For the present, data collected in this first survey will have a variety of immediate applications:

a) IASB is using the data to identify ways it must be of service to its member districts and to assess what the demand for services will be if a bargaining law should become a reality.

b) The data reveals what is being bargained in Illinois and how it is being bargained. It reveals what many districts are "bargaining" away informally, perhaps in an effort to avoid formal contracts. And it compares information between bargaining and non-bargaining districts. Hence, the data should have numerous ramifications for those who make public policy at the local, state, and national levels.

c) The data will provide school boards with a clear picture of what is being bargained in other school districts. By examining data by geographic region and by type of bargaining process, school boards should be able to resist the regional whipsawing employed by the teacher unions.

d) Finally, the data may provide each school board with a barometer for measuring its own effectiveness in its relations with its teachers and at the

bargaining table. For example, the data reveals that most boards engaged in formal bargaining are careful to limit items discussed at the table. Most boards which deal informally with teacher groups do not limit items discussed. However, it is clear that more school boards than originally thought are bargaining over critical discretionary powers--powers which the courts frequently hold cannot be delegated through a bargained contract or otherwise.

IASB welcomes suggestions for improvements in both the study content and the report format. We must strive to refine both if the study is to prove useful on an annual basis.

Harold P. Seamon
Executive Director
ILLINOIS ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL BOARDS

May, 1974

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The staff of the Illinois Association of School Boards is totally responsible for design of the survey instrument and for the collection of data that serve as the basis of this study.

We wish to gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Milton Carlson, professor of educational administration, Northern Illinois University, for the tabulation of data by computer. Without this aid, the report would not be possible.

We also wish to thank the 702 school administrators who took the time to fill out our extensive questionnaire and return it to us.

Author of the data analysis and interpretation is Ronald R. Booth, IASB Director of Management Information.

THE SURVEY

In November, 1973, IASB mailed a 60-item questionnaire to the superintendent of each of its 936 member school districts.

Questionnaires were returned from 702 districts, a response of 75 percent. These 702 respondents also represent 67 percent of the total 1,050 school districts in Illinois.

Results of the survey were tabulated by computer and are presented in a total of 24 tables. The 24 tables are divided into eight subject matter areas. Each of the eight subject areas is presented in three tables: 1) State Totals; 2) Northern Area data; and, 3) Southern Area data.

The eight subject areas of the tables correspond to eight of the chapters contained in this report:

1) Characteristics of Responding Districts
2) Board-Teacher Relationship
3) Economic Benefits for Teachers
4) Language
5) Procedures
6) Evaluation of IASB Services
7) The Future
8) Priorities for Collective Bargaining Programs and Services

Discussion in the "Results" section of each chapter will deal with both the State Totals and any significant points revealed in the regional comparisons.

Tables of State Totals are all broken down to present Chicago area data and totals without the Chicago area, as well as the combined grand totals. Chicago area is defined as Cook and DuPage Counties.

One major purpose of the study was to compare similarities and differences between districts which have signed agreements with their teacher organization and those which do not. Hence, data in the tables of State Totals are presented accordingly:

1) By districts that have signed bargaining agreements.
2) By districts that have not signed agreements.
3) Combined total of all districts.

Tables of regional data--both Northern and Southern--are broken down into smaller geographic areas. These tables are designed to reflect only the impact of geographic location. Hence, data is not broken down into the "signed agreement/no signed agreement" categories.

Southern Area data is divided into six sections based on IASB divisions (the numbers in parentheses refer to the total responses received from each section):

1) Southwestern Division (39)
2) Blackhawk and Western Divisions (51)
3) Corn Belt and Central Illinois Valley Divisions (79)
4) Abe Lincoln and Illini Divisions (85)
5) Two Rivers and Kaskaskia Divisions (57)
6) Wabash, Egyptian, and Shawnee Divisions (70)

Northern Area data also is divided into six sections:

1) Cook and DuPage Counties (145)
2) Kishwaukee Division (30)
3) Lake County (36)
4) Northwest Division (35)
5) Starved Rock Division (26)
6) Three Rivers Division (41)

Of the 702 total responses, 282 reported that they had signed agreements, 366 said that they did not, and 54 did not indicate. Thus, in the State Totals tables, the "all" columns contain more responses than the combined totals of the two "Agreement" columns.

The 702 statewide responses consist of 145 from the Chicago area (Cook and DuPage Counties), while 556 were from districts outside the Chicago area. The number of respondents presented by IASB division(s) in the Southern Area and Northern Area tables ranged from a low of 26 in the Starved Rock Division to the 145 received from Cook and DuPage Counties. Some divisions were combined for purpose of summarization, largely on the basis of geography.

Reading the Tables

In most of the 24 tables, each column of information consists of two numbers--the number of responses and the percentage which that number of responses represents. Percentages are based on the number of responses to each particular item, not on the total number of questionnaires returned.

1. CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDING DISTRICTS

Table 1 -- State Totals: Page 11
Table S-1 -- Southern Area: Page 12
Table N-1 -- Northern Area: Page 14

These tables deal with district type, number of teachers, teacher organization affiliation, and the extent of teacher affiliation.

Results: The type of district may not have much significance for this study. It may be of interest that 50 percent of the responding districts were unit districts, 37 percent were elementary districts, and 12 percent were high school districts.

A greater percentage of written agreements are found in dual districts (elementary and high school) than in unit districts. This result is probably due to the concentration of elementary and high school districts in the Chicago area. Seventy-five percent of the districts in the Chicago area are elementary and 18 percent are high school; only seven percent are units.

With the exception of the Chicago area counties (Cook, DuPage, and Lake counties), the Three Rivers Division, and the Southwestern Division, the majority of responding districts are of unit structure. This reflects the type of district found in each geographical area and does not seem to imply any significance in relationship to the bargaining process.

Number of Teachers: Few of the responding districts had less than 20 teachers. Only 63 respondents were in the range of 0-20 teachers. Yet, in the state of Illinois, there are approximately 150 districts with an average enrollment of around 100 pupils, which would imply 10 or fewer teachers. Therefore, it would seem to appear that a large percentage of the nonresponding districts, perhaps 150 to 200 of them, would be of the size, 0-20 teachers.

Data for the Chicago area indicates that there is an increasing proportion of districts with larger faculties. This means that districts there tend to be in the larger size categories. The opposite tends to be true outside the Chicago area. The data also indicates that the larger a district is, the more likely it is to have a signed agreement with a teacher organization. One might assume that a school district in the Chicago area is more likely to have a signed agreement, since districts there tend to be in the larger categories. This assumption is borne out later in Table 2, item 3 on page 18.

Teacher Organization and Affiliation: In considering the affiliation data, the Illinois Education Association (IEA) is the predominant teacher organization in Illinois.

The Illinois Federation of Teachers (IFT) strength seems to be in the Chicago area, where 16 percent of the respondents are IFT-affiliated, the Southwestern Division where 21 percent respond as IFT-affiliated, and the Blackhawk and Western Divisions where 22 percent respond as IFT-affiliated. In no other area does the union have more than three districts represented and, indeed, outside the Chicago area we find only 18 IFT districts--or three percent of the total.

Some 43 percent of the responding districts indicate that teacher organization membership includes 80 percent or more of their teachers. Note that 32 percent of the nonbargaining districts report greater than 80 percent membership, while 60 percent of the bargaining districts report greater than 80 percent membership. Also note that in the Chicago area, with a preponderance of bargaining districts, only four percent have 100 percent membership and only 45 percent indicate greater than 80 percent membership. This may only indicate that in large districts, 100 percent membership is rather difficult to obtain.

The most significant figure is probably the one indicating the percentage of the districts with less than 50 percent members. These districts would be considered as unlikely candidates for bargaining pressures until such time as the teacher organization obtains a larger membership. The areas of the state with low levels of teacher organization membership appear to be in Lake County, the Three Rivers Division, the Blackhawk and Western Divisions, the Corn Belt and Central Illinois Valley Divisions, and the Two Rivers and Kaskaskia Divisions, where, in all cases, more than 25 percent of the respondents indicated less than 50 percent membership. There seems to be no geographical significance to these data and the factors which account for this are unknown. It could, however, be due to a lack of strength in terms of the UNISERV representative in that area or the size of the district (you will note that in the areas mentioned there is also a high percentage of districts with 50 or fewer teachers and probably a concentration of rural schools). Statewide, only 28 percent of the respondents report less than 50 percent membership. This would indicate that, since 72 percent of the responding districts have over 50 percent membership and only 30 to 40 percent have signed agreements, a large number of districts still without written agreements do face organizational memberships with the potential for bringing pressure to bargain.

Discussion: The only new data of interest in characterizing our responding districts seems to be in comparing size of district to the factors of organization affiliation and strength of affiliation (items four and five in the tables). With a significant total response of 75 percent, and an indication that the responding districts are larger and more deeply involved in bargaining than the nonrespondents, we have a fairly accurate survey in terms of characterizing the status of collective bargaining in the spring of 1974 in the State of Illinois.

It is also obvious from the data that with the exception of the urban areas around St. Louis and Chicago, the teacher organization strength is predominantly IEA. Outside the City of Chicago, IFT strength is minuscule. It appears that if collective bargaining becomes mandated by law, those areas of the state where little bargaining is now going on will fall to the organizational efforts of the IEA. It would also appear that the IEA is ready in terms of membership, because about three-fourths of the districts--even nonbargaining districts--have 50 percent or more of their teachers belonging to the teacher organization.

There does not seem to be any significance to the type of district, with the exception that the dual district structure predominates in the urban areas and the urban areas are the bargaining areas at this point in time. The current efforts of the teacher organizations to write bargaining agreements seem to be most successful in the urban areas and the larger districts, which makes organizational sense in terms of the greatest benefit (dues) for the least effort. Of concern to the teacher organization must be the 25 percent of the districts responding that have less than 50 percent membership. If we include the categories of less than 80 percent membership statewide, over half of the responding districts have less than 80 percent membership in the local teacher organization. This implies a large amount of dollars lost from lack of membership. Once the 50 percent level or greater is reached in a district, efforts will probably be made organizationally to gain support for 100 percent membership, and that support, one might caution, would probably be through pressure for collective bargaining. In 64 percent of the districts without signed agreements, there is less than 80 percent membership. A teacher organization analyzing such data would have to consider its future strength to be dependent upon increased membership through increased services and/or benefits.

For management, the implication is clear that many districts presently avoid bargaining because of their geographical location (outside the urban areas), because of low membership in the local teacher organization, or because the district is small. One can only guess how long it might take for the teacher organizations to turn their attention more fully to the small, rural districts. However, the tendency toward more signed agreements each year would indicate more support for increased membership, and increased membership would probably draw in the presence of the union agent, resulting in more contracts, ad inifitum.

It appears that Illinois is going through a gradual evolution into the collective bargaining process with its teachers at a pace dependent for the most part upon the abilities and membership activities of the teacher unions throughout the state. A bargaining law would speed up the process. One might also consider that sudden changes in an evolutionary process tend to create mutations, and we must ask whether those small districts with relatively informal kinds of communications could afford the trauma of suddenly being forced by law into an adversarial relationship with their teachers.

TABLE 1

Characteristics of Responding Districts

State Totals

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	State Totals						State Less Chicago Area		Chicago Area	
	Signed Agmnt		No Agmnt		All					
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Total Respondents:	282		366		702		556		145	
2. Type of District:										
a. Elementary	114	40	114	31	257	37	148	27	109	75
b. High School	48	17	36	10	87	12	60	11	26	18
c. Unit	119	42	211	58	352	50	342	62	10	7
d. Dual (Joint Admin.).	1	1	5	1	6	1	6	1	0	0
3. Number of Teachers:										
a. 0-20	2	1	45	12	63	9	62	11	1	1
b. 21-50	40	14	173	48	230	33	211	39	19	13
c. 51-85	59	21	81	22	144	21	127	23	17	12
d. 86-110	46	16	27	7	77	11	54	10	23	16
e. Over 110	132	47	34	9	176	25	90	16	85	59
4. Teacher Organization Affiliation:										
a. IEA	226	80	258	70	509	73	422	76	86	59
b. Union	34	12	7	2	41	6	18	3	23	16
c. Neither	12	4	93	25	132	19	101	18	31	21
d. Both	10	4	8	2	19	3	14	2	5	3
5. Percent of Teachers as Organization Members:										
a. 100	37	14	26	8	64	10	59	11	5	4
b. 80-100	125	46	80	24	215	33	162	31	52	41
c. 50-80	84	31	96	29	190	29	138	26	52	41
d. Less than 50	27	10	129	39	181	28	163	31	18	14

TABLE S-1

Characteristics of Responding Districts

Southern Area

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	South-Western		Black-hawk & Western		Corn Belt & CIV		Abe Linc. & Illini		2 Rivers & Kaskaskia		Wabash, Egyptian, Shawnee	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Total Respondents:	39		51		79		85		57		70	
2. Type of District:												
a. Elementary	14	36	5	10	20	25	12	14	11	19	10	14
b. High School	3	8	1	2	10	13	5	6	3	5	10	14
c. Unit	22	56	45	88	48	61	67	79	41	72	48	69
d. Dual (Joint Admin.) .	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	4	2	3
3. Number of Teachers:												
a. 0-20	6	15	2	4	12	15	12	14	10	18	6	9
b. 21-50	9	23	19	37	31	39	36	42	23	40	30	43
c. 51-85	10	26	17	33	21	27	20	24	10	18	13	19
d. 86-110	5	13	4	8	7	9	6	7	7	12	8	11
e. Over 110	9	23	9	18	8	10	11	13	7	12	13	19
4. Teacher Organization Affiliation:												
a. IEA	25	64	39	76	51	65	73	86	40	70	60	87
b. Union	8	21	11	22	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
c. Neither	6	15	0	0	25	32	10	12	16	28	7	10
d. Both	0	0	1	2	2	2	1	1	0	0	1	1

Table S-1 -- Continued

	South-Western		Black-hawk & Western		Corn Belt & CIV		Abe Linc. & Illini		2 Rivers & Kaskaskia		Wabash, Egyptian, Shawnee	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
5. Percent of Teachers as Organization Members:												
a. 100	2	5	1	2	6	8	2	2	2	4	10	16
b. 80-100	15	41	8	17	15	21	28	33	15	29	24	38
c. 50-80	12	32	21	44	22	31	31	37	16	31	15	23
d. Less than 50	8	22	18	37	29	40	19	24	19	36	15	23

TABLE N-1

Characteristics of Responding Districts

Northern Area

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	Cook & DuPage		Kish.		Lake		North-west		Starved Rock		Three Rivers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Total Respondents:	145		30		36		35		26		41	
2. Type of District:												
a. Elementary	109	75	9	30	25	69	7	20	11	42	20	49
b. High School	26	18	2	7	7	19	3	9	8	31	8	20
c. Unit	10	7	19	63	4	11	25	71	7	27	13	32
d. Dual (Joint Admin.)..	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Number of Teachers:												
a. 0-20	1	1	0	0	4	12	3	9	2	9	5	14
b. 21-50	19	13	14	47	7	21	13	39	12	52	14	38
c. 51-85	17	12	7	23	6	18	10	30	6	26	4	11
d. 86-110	23	16	1	3	5	15	4	12	2	9	5	14
e. Over 110	85	59	8	27	11	33	3	9	1	4	9	24
4. Teacher Organization Affiliation:												
a. IEA	86	59	27	90	24	67	31	89	23	88	26	63
b. Union	23	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	7
c. Neither	31	21	2	7	9	25	3	9	1	4	8	20
d. Both	5	3	1	3	3	8	1	3	0	0	4	10

Table N-1 -- Continued

	Cook & DuPage		Kish.		Lake		North-west		Starved Rock		Three Rivers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
5. Percent of Teachers as Organization Members:												
a. 100	5	4	7	23	5	15	12	34	7	27	3	8
b. 80-100	52	41	11	37	9	26	13	37	13	50	9	24
c. 50-80	52	41	5	17	4	12	6	17	2	8	4	10
d. Less than 50	18	14	7	23	16	47	4	11	4	15	22	58

2. BOARD-TEACHER RELATIONSHIP

Table 2 -- State Totals: Page 18
Table S-2 -- Southern Area: Page 19
Table N-2 -- Northern Area: Page 20

These tables attempt to further define the relationship between the teacher and the school management in the responding districts.

Results: Item one in the tables presents the percentage of districts that report having signed agreements with their teachers. The state totals show 40 percent of the districts with signed agreements: The Chicago area with 68 percent and the state outside the Chicago area with 33 percent. The range is from a low of 15 percent in the Two Rivers and Kaskaskia Divisions to a high of 68 percent in Cook and DuPage Counties. The next highest percentages are in the Southwest Division (including suburban St. Louis), Lake County (north of Chicago), and the Starved Rock, Northwest, and Kishwaukee Divisions (west of the Chicago metropolitan area).

Item two identifies what is discussed with the teacher organization, or the scope of discussion, in various areas of the state. Only a very small percentage of the responding districts indicated that they do not meet with their teachers at all. Where significant numbers of districts indicated they do not meet with teachers, there is a similarity of response with bargaining area statistics from Table 1 indicating that there is no pressure--or little pressure--in those areas to bargain with the teacher organization. (This applies, for example, in the Corn Belt, Central Illinois Valley, Abe Lincoln, Illini, Wabash, Egyptian, and Shawnee Divisions--Table S-1.)

In comparing districts with signed agreements versus those without, it is interesting to note that those with signed agreements have a greater tendency to limit the items under discussion (i.e., only 34 percent of the districts with agreements discuss any item). By contrast, 52 percent of the districts without agreements discuss any item.

In item three, it is interesting to note that in the districts without a signed agreement, 41 percent meet formally and 59 percent meet informally with their teacher organizations. Statewide totals show 23 percent meeting formally, 33 percent informally, and 44 percent have written agreements. In the Chicago area, only 15 percent of the districts still meet informally, and 68 percent have signed written agreements.

In item two, only 15 percent of the districts in the Chicago area limit bargaining to salary and economic items, while 43 percent will discuss working conditions and 38 percent will discuss any item. It would appear that even in the bargaining areas, the potential for limiting the bargaining process only to economic items is very difficult and will probably not occur.

Discussion: These data tend to reaffirm some of the conclusions drawn in the first set of tables. For example, bargaining districts tend to be in the urban areas. Data also suggest that teachers are "communicating" with boards of education, regardless of whether a signed agreement exists in the district. It appears that few teachers in the state of Illinois, at least in the responding districts, are without a voice in at least economics and working conditions, and approximately half of them have a formal voice in anything which concerns them. The vast majority of boards (93 percent) involve their teachers or teacher organizations in the decision-making process, either through a formal process--with or without an agreement--or an informal process of meet and confer communication of some sort. These tendencies appear throughout the data from all areas of the state. There seems to be very little difference from southern Illinois through central Illinois on into the northern Illinois area. The major variable seems to be whether the faculty and board have formalized their procedures with a signed agreement.

One might then question why the formality of bargaining is of such great concern to teachers and board members in the state of Illinois. If, indeed, boards are communicating with teachers, and if, indeed, teachers have a voice in the decision-making process, why is there a need to legislate the process at the state level? The answer to this probably lies in the data in Table 1, which indicate there are a large number of teachers in the state of Illinois who have not affiliated and paid dues to the teacher organization. From an economic standpoint, the state teacher organizations want to get increased membership, which requires that they convince teachers that equality and all the good things can only accrue through the signed agreement. This, of course, requires organization support to train and assist in getting that agreement and in selling the need for a bargaining agreement to public officials in the state of Illinois.

Only seven percent of the school boards in this study do not recognize their teacher groups either formally or informally. From this and data in the subsequent tables, one can reasonably conclude that the single greatest result of bargaining legislation in Illinois will be to ease the task of teacher organizations in building up their memberships.

TABLE 2

Board-Teacher Relationship /

State Totals

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	State Totals						State Less Chicago Area		Chicago Area	
	Signed Agmnt		No Agmnt		All					
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Percent Agreements from total Responses:	282	100	0	0	282	40	182	33	99	68
2. We meet with staff to discuss:										
a. Salary and economic items only	58	21	80	22	138	20	117	21	21	15
b. Economic-related working conditions .	128	46	93	26	223	32	162	30	61	43
c. Any Item	94	34	188	52	283	41	228	42	54	38
d. Do not meet with teachers	0	0	4	1	49	7	42	8	7	5
3. If answer above was a, b, or c, have you:										
a. Jointly signed agreement	282	100	0	0	282	44	182	36	99	72
b. No agreement/meet formally	0	0	151	41	151	23	133	26	18	13
c. Meet informally	0	0	215	59	215	33	195	38	20	15

TABLE S-2

Board-Teacher Relationship

Southern Area

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	South-Western		Black-hawk & Western		Corn Belt & CIV		Abe Linc. & Illini		2 Rivers & Kaskaskia		Wabash, Egyptian, Shawnee	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Percent Agreements from total Responses:	21	54	14	28	22	28	20	24	8	14	17	24
2. We meet with staff to discuss												
a. Salary and economic items only	9	24	11	22	21	27	15	18	14	25	10	14
b. Economic-related working conditions .	19	51	12	24	23	29	20	24	9	16	20	29
c. Any item	8	22	25	49	27	34	40	48	29	52	30	44
d. Do not meet with teachers	1	3	3	6	8	10	9	11	4	7	9	13
3. If answer above was a, b, or c, have you:												
a. Jointly signed agreement	21	60	14	29	22	30	20	26	8	15	17	29
b. No agreement/meet formally	5	14	9	19	23	31	22	29	21	40	21	36
c. Meet informally	9	26	25	52	29	39	34	45	23	44	21	36

TABLE N-2

Board-Teacher Relationship

Northern Area

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	Cook & DuPage		Kish.		Lake		North-west		Starved Rock		Three Rivers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Percent Agreements from total Responses:	99	68	19	63	17	47	15	43	13	50	14	34
2. We meet with staff to discuss:												
a. Salary and economic items only	21	15	9	31	2	6	8	23	7	27	9	22
b. Economic-related working conditions ..	61	43	12	41	16	46	11	31	5	19	12	29
c. Any item	54	38	8	28	14	40	15	43	13	50	17	42
d. Do not meet with teachers	7	5	0	0	3	9	1	3	1	4	3	7
3. If answer above was a, b, or c, have you:												
a. Jointly signed agreement	99	72	19	63	17	52	15	44	13	52	14	38
b. No agreement/meet formally	18	13	5	17	6	18	7	21	4	16	9	24
c. Meet informally	20	15	6	20	10	30	12	35	8	32	14	38

3. ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR TEACHERS

Table 3 -- State Totals: Page 24
Table S-3 -- Southern Area: Page 26
Table N-3 -- Northern Area: Page 28

Teacher salary studies typically use dollar amounts. Their results usually indicate significantly higher salaries and related economic benefits in bargaining districts as opposed to nonbargaining districts.

If the data in Table 3 are accurate, one might surmise that salary differences are due more to location or geography than to the impact of bargaining. The fact is that urban salaries are higher than rural salaries--in all fields--and bargaining districts tend to be in the urban areas. Salary studies typically ignore this important variable.

To account for the urban/rural differential, the questions posed in this study did not deal with actual dollar amounts. Rather, respondents were asked to compare their salaries with neighboring districts.

Results: The data seem to indicate little difference between bargaining districts and nonbargaining districts statewide. Eighty-eight districts with signed agreements reported above-average salaries; 68 nonbargaining districts reported above-average salaries; and, 161 total districts statewide reported above-average salaries. The nonbargaining districts include 19 percent with above-average salaries, the bargaining districts include 31 percent with above-average salaries. The Chicago area reported 28 percent of the districts with above-average salaries and 22 percent with below average salaries. Very few districts rated their salaries as below average, which would tend to skew the data somewhat, and there was, perhaps, a psychological tendency to consider salaries as average compared to other districts. If one is to find any difference due to a collective bargaining agreement, it would have to be in the districts with signed agreements reporting above-average salaries. However, less than one-third of the bargaining districts report above-average salaries--which is not much greater than the percentage of nonbargaining districts reporting above-average salaries.

If there is any tendency in salaries, it would appear to be that most salaries are average when compared to nearby districts and that there may be very little difference between salary schedules from district to district regardless of the bargaining relationship existing in those districts.

When we look at item two, the same result can be seen. For the 1973-74 salary year, 7 percent with signed agreements reported raises over 8 percent, while 3 percent of the nonbargaining districts reported raises over 8 percent. Seventy-four percent of the bargaining districts reported between 5 and 8 percent salary increases, and 64 percent of the

nonbargaining districts reported increases between 5 and 8 percent. Thirty-one percent of the nonbargaining districts reported increases of 2 to 5 percent. However, when we look at the comparison between the Chicago area and the rest of the state, we see similar results; that is, in the Chicago area only 10 percent are in the 2 to 5 percent increase range. This leads one to question whether the increase was due to the bargaining process or due to geography, urban pressures and such economic factors as cost of living, raises in other industries, etc. If there is any dollar advantage to teachers in bargaining areas, it would appear to be that the presence of the bargaining agreement would tend to keep the less-than-average increase from being granted by the board of education. It may be tough to "bargain" a less-than-average raise.

In item three, formal salary schedule versus merit raises, the obvious conclusion in all types of districts and in all areas of Illinois is that salary schedules predominate. An insignificant number report merit raises and only a handful report merit raises in addition to a salary schedule.

Items four through nine relate to fringe benefits. Hospital and medical insurance seems to be a rather common fringe benefit, with 79 percent of the districts affording either complete or partial payment of premiums. In the Chicago area, 94 percent provide some hospital and medical coverage. There seems to be no significant difference between bargaining and nonbargaining districts, although in bargaining districts only 9 percent report no contribution at all paid by the board. Life insurance or disability is paid partially or fully in approximately half of the districts in Illinois, ranging from 71 percent in the Chicago area to 30 percent outside the Chicago area. Fifty-seven percent of the bargaining districts provide this benefit and 31 percent of nonbargaining districts provide it. Again, it shows that the urban areas provide this benefit to a greater degree than the rural areas of the state.

Pay for extra duties and personal leave days seem to be paid by a majority of the school districts statewide. College credit reimbursement is paid by about half of the districts in the state. Various forms of reimbursement for unused sick leave pay seem to be a benefit not provided to any significant extent, with only 11 percent in the Chicago area and 9 percent outside the Chicago area reporting pay for unused sick leave.

Discussion: It is difficult to ascertain whether the slightly higher raises granted to teachers and the slightly higher number of above-average salaries can be attributed to the presence of a bargaining agreement or to location in an urban area. There is a slight increase due to one of these factors, but which one is difficult to determine from the data. It must be cautioned that one person's average might well be another person's above or below average. Also, the percent of raise last year might be a better indicator of urban/rural or bargaining/nonbargaining differentials than the comparative salary data. If so, then either the urban area factor or the presence of a bargaining agreement is significant in producing few below-average salary increases. But neither factor seems significant in producing

above-average salaries. The fact that salary schedules are reported in almost all districts in Illinois would tend to discourage efforts in trying to promote the concept of merit raises in Illinois, unless it could be done through the use of the salary schedule itself.

In the fringe benefits area, it appears that the presence of a collective bargaining agreement and/or the urban area factor somewhat increases the likelihood of a particular fringe benefit occuring in a school district. Hospital and medical insurance, pay for extra duties, and personal leave days seem to be fairly common, regardless of location or whether bargaining is involved. Reimbursement for college credit appears slightly more prevalent in the Chicago area and is found in about half of the districts statewide. Life insurance and disability is provided in 71 percent of the Chicago area districts, slightly over half in the bargaining districts, and only in about one-third of the nonbargaining or downstate districts. Pay for unused sick leave is not prevalent in any situation in Illinois, with less than 10 percent providing that particular benefit. It would seem that the fringe benefits may either be slightly higher or agreed to earlier in bargaining districts. If the latter is true, then the presence of formal bargaining may hasten the acceptance by the board of a particular fringe benefit for the district's faculty.

The presence of a bargaining agreement seemingly makes it difficult to resist at least average salary increases and traditional fringe benefits. The presence of such a relationship from the data in Table 3, however, does not indicate any significantly higher salaries nor any significantly greater fringe benefits given to the local faculty. Too much may have been made by other researchers of the push-pull effect of bargaining versus nonbargaining districts. Whether the bargaining districts pulled along the nonbargaining districts, or whether there is an effort to catch up on the part of the nonbargaining districts, may not be due to the presence or absence of a bargaining agreement. With the present teacher surplus and the lack of competition for the better teacher, there may not be any need for any district to "catch up," and these forces cannot be as significant as they may have been five years ago. Bargaining districts in certain situations may have to catch up with other bargaining districts and, in effect, nonbargaining districts may begin pushing bargaining districts to provide benefits similar to those that are given outside of the process of bargaining. Increasing the scope of the discussion issues would be an example where bargaining districts are currently "behind" nonbargaining districts (see Section 6).

TABLE 3

Economic Benefits for Teachers

State Totals

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	State Totals						State Less Chicago Area		Chicago Area	
	Signed Agmnt		No Agmnt		All					
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Your Teacher Salaries Compared to Nearby Districts:										
a. Above Average	88	31	68	19	161	23	119	22	41	28
b. Average	177	63	251	69	458	66	365	66	93	64
c. Below Average	17	6	44	12	78	11	67	12	11	8
d. Uncertain	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
2. Percent of Raise Last Year (Per teacher 1973-74):										
a. Over 8	20	7	12	3	37	5	24	4	13	9
b. 5-8	205	74	231	64	469	68	355	64	113	80
c. 2-5	52	19	111	31	178	26	163	30	15	10
d. Less than 2	1		9	2	11	2	10	2	1	1
3. We have:										
a. Formal Salary Schedule	270	96	346	95	662	95	536	97	125	87
b. Merit Raises	2	1	1	0	4	1	3	0	1	1
c. Neither	1	0	10	3	15	2	10	2	5	3
d. Both	9	3	8	2	19	3	6	1	13	9
4. Hospital and Medical:										
a. Flat Amt. Per Teacher	118	42	123	34	255	36	200	36	55	38
b. Board Pays Complete	139	49	146	40	301	43	220	40	80	56
c. Neither	25	9	95	26	143	20	134	24	9	6
5. Life Insurance or Disability:										
a. Yes, Paid by Board	95	47	66	23	175	33	86	22	88	61
b. Yes, Paid Partially by Board	19	10	24	8	45	9	30	8	15	10
c. No	87	43	193	68	309	58	268	70	41	28

Table 3 (Continued)

	State Totals						State Less Chicago Area		Chicago Area	
	Signed Agmnt		No Agmnt		All					
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
6. Pay for Extra Duties:										
a. Yes	-	-	-	-	585	86	448	84	137	96
b. No	-	-	-	-	94	14	88	16	6	4
7. Reimbursement for College Credit:										
a. Yes	-	-	-	-	366	54	273	50	93	66
b. No	-	-	-	-	320	46	272	50	48	34
8. Personal Leave:										
a. 1 or More Days	-	-	-	-	496	72	366	67	130	92
b. None	-	-	-	-	187	28	177	33	10	7
9. Unused Sick Leave Pay:										
a. Yes	-	-	-	-	60	9	44	9	16	11
b. No	-	-	-	-	625	91	499	91	126	89

TABLE S-3

Economic Benefits for Teachers

Southern Area

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	South-Western		Black-hawk & Western		Corn Belt & CIV		Abe Linc. & Illini		2 Rivers & Kaskaskia		Wabash, Egyptian, Shawnee	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Your Teacher Salaries Compared to Nearby Districts:												
a. Above average	7	18	9	18	19	24	16	19	15	26	12	17
b. Average	26	67	34	68	54	68	54	64	32	56	48	69
c. Below average	6	15	7	14	6	8	14	16	10	18	10	14
d. Uncertain	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
2. Percent of Raise Last Year (Per teacher 1973-1974):												
a. Over 8	1	3	0	0	3	4	2	2	1	2	6	9
b. 5-8	27	71	30	60	51	65	51	60	32	56	43	61
c. 2-5	10	26	19	38	25	32	28	33	22	39	19	27
d. Less than 2	0	0	1	2	0	0	4	5	2	3	2	3
3. We have:												
a. Formal salary schedule	39	100	49	96	75	95	83	98	56	100	68	97
b. Merit raises	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c. Neither	0	0	1	2	4	5	2	2	0	0	1	1
d. Both	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Table S-3 -- Continued

	South-Western		Black-hawk & Western		Corn Belt & CIV		Abe Linc. & Illini		2 Rivers & Kaskaskia		Wabash, Egyptian Shawnee	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
4. Hospital and Medical:												
a. Flat amt. per teacher	17	44	22	43	32	40	27	32	14	25	25	36
b. Board pays complete .	17	44	17	33	37	47	25	29	19	33	14	20
c. Neither	5	12	12	24	10	13	33	39	24	42	30	44
5. Life Insurance or Disability:												
a. Yes, paid by board ..	12	32	10	20	28	35	21	25	4	7	9	13
b. Yes, paid partially by board	4	10	5	10	5	6	9	10	3	5	4	6
c. No	22	58	34	70	46	59	55	65	49	88	57	81
6. Pay for Extra Duties:												
a. Yes	37	97	40	98	74	94	78	92	48	86	56	81
b. No	1	3	1	2	5	6	7	8	8	14	13	19
7. Reimbursement for College Credit:												
a. Yes	21	55	26	51	46	59	37	44	24	43	26	38
b. No	17	45	25	49	32	41	48	56	32	57	43	62
8. Personal Leave:												
a. 1 or more days	26	68	37	73	47	62	51	60	36	64	44	64
b. None	12	32	14	27	29	38	34	40	20	36	25	36
9. Unused Sick Leave Pay:												
a. Yes	7	18	2	4	5	6	5	6	8	15	7	10
b. No	31	82	49	96	73	94	79	94	47	85	62	90

TABLE N-3

Economic Benefits for Teachers

Northern Area

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	Cook & DuPage		Kish.		Lake		North-west		Starved Rock		Three Rivers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Your Teacher Salaries Compared to Nearby Districts:												
a. Above average	41	28	6	21	4	11	11	32	7	27	12	30
b. Average	93	64	22	76	27	75	20	59	19	73	24	60
c. Below average	11	8	1	3	5	14	3	9	0	0	4	10
d. Uncertain	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Percent of Raise Last Year (Per teacher 1973-1974):												
a. Over 8	13	9	2	7	3	8	3	9	2	8	1	2
b. 5-8	113	80	23	77	27	75	16	47	17	65	34	85
c. 2-5	15	10	5	17	6	17	15	44	7	27	5	12
d. Less than 2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. We have:												
a. Formal salary schedule	125	87	29	97	31	86	35	100	25	96	39	95
b. Merit raises	1	1	0	0	2	6	0	0	1	4	0	0
c. Neither	5	3	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
d. Both	13	9	1	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5

Table II-3 -- Continued

	Cook & DuPage		Kish.		Lake		North-west		Starved Rock		Three Rivers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
4. Hospital and Medical:												
a. Flat amt. per teacher.	55	38	14	47	13	36	13	37	8	31	13	32
b. Board pays complete ..	80	56	16	53	20	56	15	43	15	58	23	56
c. Neither	9	6	0	0	3	8	7	20	3	11	5	12
5. Life Insurance or Disability:												
a. Yes, paid by board ...	88	61	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
b. Yes, paid partially by board	15	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
c. No.	41	28	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. Pay for Extra Duties:												
a. Yes	137	96	21	70	23	64	25	71	19	73	27	66
b. No	6	4	9	30	13	36	10	29	7	27	14	34
7. Reimbursement for College Credit:												
a. Yes	93	66	15	30	23	64	22	63	14	54	19	46
b. No.	48	34	15	30	13	36	13	37	12	46	22	54
8. Personal Leave:												
a. 1 or more days	130	93	28	93	30	83	23	66	16	62	28	68
b. None	10	7	2	7	6	17	12	34	10	38	13	32
9. Unused Sick Leave Pay:												
a. Yes.....	16	11	1	3	3	8	3	9	1	4	2	5
b. No.....	126	89	29	97	33	92	32	91	25	96	39	95

4. LANGUAGE

Table 4 -- State Totals: Page 33
Table S-4 -- Southern Area: Page 36
Table N-4 -- Northern Area: Page 40

This section is designed to produce an overview of the types of clauses and terms that are found in either written agreements or policy statements in districts throughout the state.

Results: The most common types of clauses, such as recognition, procedure, scope, impasse, and grievance, were found in a considerably high number of districts throughout the state. Recognition statements were found in 50 percent of the districts outside of the Chicago area, 69 percent statewide, and 83 percent in the Chicago area. It is interesting to find in the downstate areas that, while only 33 percent had a written agreement, 59 percent had some sort of recognition. It might be concluded that a number of districts not reporting written agreements have recognized their teacher organization as an agent for bargaining with the board.

Approximately half of the districts in the state have established procedures for bargaining. About three-fourths of the districts in the Chicago area have established procedures. A smaller number have limited the scope of the relationship. Only 38 percent downstate have limited scope, while 68 percent in the Chicago area have limited the range of issues discussed. What this suggests is that a limitation of scope is more likely to occur in an area where the procedures of bargaining are put into a written contractual form; that is, to tighten up the issues at the bargaining table.

Among impasse procedures, we find that the bargaining areas and those with written agreements have, in 78 percent of the cases, provided a procedure for impasse resolution. Even without a written agreement, 13 percent of the nonbargaining districts have written in a procedure for impasse. This would suggest that at least 13 percent of those reporting no written agreement, in effect, have a fairly sophisticated process of collective bargaining in their district without a formal or written contract. Statewide about 40 percent of the districts have some sort of impasse resolution procedure. In the Chicago area, 56 percent have an impasse procedure, compared to 34 percent downstate.

Grievance procedures, again, are found in a much greater percentage of bargaining districts (87 percent), whereas only 25 percent of the nonbargaining districts provide a grievance procedure. It appears that the presence of an agreement produces a demand for a grievance procedure and for third-party intervention.

Two other clauses indicate that some items which are not recommended by management as bargainable issues are being included in the bargaining process. Items six and seven relate to class size and school calendar.

Chicago area districts reported 36 percent who consider class size, but only 20 percent consider class size in their written agreements. Downstate, only 10 percent deal with class size, including 6 percent in their agreements. This implies that class size is not a common issue for bargaining. However, it appears to be slightly more prevalent in the Chicago area, which has a high percentage of written agreements. School calendar is less prevalent than class size and where it is included, it is more apt to be included in policy with teacher input than in the written agreement. Only 22 percent of the Chicago area respondents include the school calendar in their written agreements.

The terms "good faith" . . . "matters of mutual concern" . . . "association and teacher rights" are found in a significant number of written agreements or policies statewide. "Good faith" is a common term used in employee relations; however, it has a tendency to be misconstrued by employees not familiar with bargaining procedures. "Good faith" merely means that both parties agree to participate in the bargaining process and does not infer acquiescence or concurrence with a demand from either party. About half of the Chicago area districts include "good faith" in their agreements. Only about one-third of the downstate respondents include "good faith" in their agreements.

"Matters of mutual concern" is a term which is misconstrued also in that it generally appears in a context that requires introduction by only one party rather than both to bring it to discussion. It appears in slightly less than half of the districts in the Chicago area and only 20 percent downstate. "Association and teacher rights," which can range from complex to simple rights, also is found in about half of the districts in the Chicago area and approximately 20 percent downstate. Few districts, statewide, put "association and teacher rights" into policy as an alternative to the written agreement.

Other terms included in the questionnaire appear less frequently statewide. "Just cause" appears in only 22 percent of the Chicago area agreements and in less than 10 percent downstate. (This is fortunate, because "just cause" generally provides a higher degree of job security than that afforded in the Tenure Law.) "Evaluation procedures" are found in considerable numbers of districts but, for the most part, are found in policy as opposed to written agreements. Downstate, only 14 percent of the districts have "evaluation procedures" in their agreements--increasing to a high of 38 percent in the Chicago area. "Maintenance of standards" is found in neither policy nor agreement in 73 percent of the districts statewide. The NEA "code of ethics" is found in 7 percent of the written agreements statewide.

Discussion: One characteristic of bargaining districts is the higher degree of formality in the relationship between school boards and teachers. This is reflected in comparing Chicago area with downstate and in comparing districts having signed agreements with districts not having them.

There is a significantly higher percentage of districts in the urban or bargaining areas that have agreed to procedures, scope, impasse resolution, grievance, and recognition than in the nonbargaining areas. Dealing with such things as class size and school calendar also is more often found in those districts which have a higher degree of collective bargaining sophistication.

Certain terminology also is more apt to appear in districts with collective bargaining agreements and/or the urban areas. It is obvious then that collective bargaining as a formal process has a tendency to produce language which would not be considered were it not for the bargaining relationship with the employee group. It must be cautioned, however, that the mere presence of such terminology and/or clause construction does not, in and of itself, create a problem for school district management. The way the clauses are written and/or the context in which the terms are found may be as important as their mere presence. Of course, the fact that they are present increases the potential for disruption over disagreement resulting from such language. Certainly, it can be concluded that one result of formal employee relationships within a school district is the increased likelihood of having to apply sophisticated language and/or procedures to the administration of legal and practical matters in the district.

TABLE 4

Language

State Totals

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	State Totals						State Less Chicago Area		Chicago Area	
	Signed Agmnt		No Agmnt		All					
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
In your written agreement or board policy, the following clauses are included:										
1. Recognition (Agree to meet with organized teacher group):										
a. Agreement	-	-	-	-	318	51	218	45	100	74
b. Policy	-	-	-	-	82	13	70	14	12	9
c. Neither	-	-	-	-	224	36	201	41	23	17
2. Procedures (who, when, where, etc.)										
a. Agreement	-	-	-	-	271	43	178	36	93	69
b. Policy	-	-	-	-	56	9	50	10	6	4
c. Neither	-	-	-	-	304	48	268	54	36	27
3. Scope (limits items considered):										
a. Agreement	-	-	-	-	241	39	157	32	84	63
b. Policy	-	-	-	-	35	6	28	6	7	5
c. Neither	-	-	-	-	345	55	302	62	43	32
4. Impasse Procedure:										
a. Mediation only	83	30	6	2	90	14	62	11	28	21
b. Factfinding only ...	20	7	3	1	24	4	17	3	7	5
c. Both	92	33	13	4	105	17	71	13	34	25
d. Other	22	8	18	6	40	6	33	7	6	4
e. None		-		-	372	59	313	66	59	44
5. Grievance Procedure:										
a. Yes, to board only .	144	52	71	23	226	36	167	33	58	43
b. Arbitration	98	35	5	2	104	16	58	12	46	34
c. None	37	13	237	76	301	48	271	55	30	22

Table 4 (Continued)

	State Totals						State Less Chicago Area		Chicago Area	
	Signed Agmnt		No Agmnt		All					
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
(Clauses in your agreement or policy - continued)										
6. Class Size:										
a. Agreement		-		-	59	9	32	6	27	20
b. Policy		-		-	41	7	19	4	22	16
c. Neither		-		-	528	84	443	90	85	63
7. School Calendar:										
a. Agreement		-		-	72	11	43	9	29	22
b. Policy, teacher input.		-		-	95	15	62	12	33	24
c. Neither		-		-	462	74	389	79	73	54
The following terms can be found in your written agreement or policy:										
8. Good Faith:										
a. Agreement		-		-	226	35	151	31	75	56
b. Policy		-		-	37	6	29	6	8	6
c. Neither		-		-	360	58	309	63	51	38
9. Matters of Mutual Concern:										
a. Agreement		-		-	158	25	100	20	58	43
b. Policy		-		-	74	12	63	13	11	8
c. Neither		-		-	402	63	335	67	67	49
10. Just Cause:										
a. Agreement		-		-	75	12	46	9	29	22
b. Policy		-		-	39	6	28	6	11	8
c. Neither		-		-	502	82	407	85	95	70
11. Academic Freedom:										
a. Agreement		-		-	67	11	35	7	32	24
b. Policy		-		-	75	12	51	11	24	18
c. Neither		-		-	473	77	394	82	79	58
12. Evaluation Procedures:										
a. Agreement		-		-	125	20	73	14	52	38
b. Policy		-		-	182	29	135	29	47	34
c. Neither		-		-	318	51	280	57	38	28

Table 4 (Continued)

	State Totals						State Less Chicago		Chicago	
	Signed Agmnt		No Agmnt		All					
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
(Terms found in your agreement or policy - continued)										
13. Maintenance of Standards:										
a. Agreement		-		-	53	8	31	6	20	15
b. Policy		-		-	121	19	95	19	26	19
c. Neither		-		-	457	73	368	75	89	66
14. Association and Teacher Rights:										
a. Agreement		-		-	162	26	94	19	68	50
b. Policy		-		-	81	13	63	13	18	13
c. Neither		-		-	379	61	330	68	49	36
15. NEA Code of Ethics:										
a. Agreement		-		-	47	7	35	7	12	9
b. Policy		-		-	35	6	23	5	12	9
c. Neither		-		-	538	87	427	88	111	82

TABLE S-4

Language

Southern Area

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	South-Western		Black-hawk & Western		Corn Belt & CIV		Abe Linc. & Illini		2 Rivers & Kaskaskia		Wabash, Egyptian, Shawnee	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
In your written agreement or board policy, the following clauses are included:												
1. Recognition (Agree to meet with organized teacher group):												
a. Agreement	23	64	14	30	24	36	21	28	9	18	18	30
b. Policy	7	19	8	17	14	21	20	27	9	18	12	20
c. Neither	6	17	24	52	29	43	34	45	31	64	31	50
2. Procedures (who, when, where, etc.)												
a. Agreement	22	61	14	31	23	34	20	27	9	18	17	29
b. Policy	5	14	6	13	13	19	10	14	7	14	9	16
c. Neither	9	25	25	56	31	46	43	59	33	67	32	55
3. Scope (limits items considered):												
a. Agreement	17	47	12	27	21	31	20	27	7	14	14	24
b. Policy	1	3	5	11	4	6	8	11	2	4	8	14
c. Neither	18	50	28	62	43	63	45	62	40	82	36	62

Table S-4 -- Continued

	South-Western		Black-hawk & Western		Corn Belt & CIV		Abe Linc. & Illini		2 Rivers & Kaskaskia		Wabash, Egyptian, Shawnee	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
(Clauses in your policy or agreement - continued)												
4. Impasse Procedure:												
a. Mediation only	8	23	4	9	9	14	4	6	2	4	6	10
b. Factfinding only	3	9	0	0	4	6	2	3	1	2	4	7
c. Both	8	23	9	20	6	9	13	18	4	8	11	19
d. Other	1	3	4	9	6	9	4	6	2	4	1	2
e. None	15	43	27	61	41	62	50	68	40	82	37	63
5. Grievance Procedure:												
a. Yes, to board only ...	18	51	15	34	26	39	26	36	10	20	24	41
b. Arbitration	8	23	5	11	4	6	3	4	3	6	6	10
c. None	9	26	24	55	36	55	44	60	36	74	28	49
6. Class Size:												
a. Agreement	1	3	4	9	1	2	4	6	0	0	5	9
b. Policy	6	17	2	5	3	4	3	4	3	6	2	3
c. Neither	29	81	38	86	63	94	65	89	46	94	52	88
7. School Calendar:												
a. Agreement	2	6	2	4	2	3	5	7	1	2	5	8
b. Policy, teacher input.	8	22	8	18	14	21	13	18	9	18	10	17
c. Neither	26	72	35	78	50	76	56	76	39	80	44	75

Table S-4 -- Continued

	South-Western		Black-hawk & Western		Corn Belt & CIV		Abe Linc. & Illini		2 Rivers & Kaskaskia		Wabash, Egyptian, Shawnee	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
The following terms can be found in your written agreement or policy:												
8. Good Faith:												
a. Agreement	19	54	14	31	17	26	17	23	7	15	14	24
b. Policy	3	9	3	7	6	9	8	11	3	6	6	10
c. Neither	13	37	28	62	42	65	48	66	38	79	39	66
9. Matters of Mutual Concern:												
a. Agreement	12	33	7	17	7	11	12	17	4	8	11	19
b. Policy	2	6	6	15	14	21	15	21	7	14	9	16
c. Neither	22	61	28	68	44	68	45	62	38	78	37	65
10. Just Cause:												
a. Agreement	5	14	5	12	1	1	7	10	4	8	8	14
b. Policy	2	6	3	7	9	14	5	7	5	10	9	16
c. Neither	29	81	33	81	55	85	60	83	39	82	39	70
11. Academic Freedom:												
a. Agreement	2	6	2	5	2	3	3	4	1	2	5	9
b. Policy	6	17	6	15	10	15	10	14	9	18	10	17
c. Neither	28	78	33	80	53	82	59	82	39	80	42	74
12. Evaluation Procedures:												
a. Agreement	6	17	3	7	3	5	10	14	0	0	7	12
b. Policy	15	42	22	54	33	51	30	42	14	29	21	37
c. Neither	15	42	16	39	29	45	32	44	35	71	29	51

Table S-4 -- Continued

	South-Western		Black-hawk & Western		Corn Belt & CIV		Abe Linc. & Illini		2 Rivers & Kaskaskia		Wabash, Egyptian, Shawnee	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
(Terms found in your policy or agreement - continued)												
13. Maintenance of Standards:												
a. Agreement	3	8	3	7	2	3	7	10	0	0	2	4
b. Policy	7	19	10	24	21	32	15	21	15	31	17	30
c. Neither	26	72	28	68	42	65	50	69	34	69	37	66
14. Association and Teacher Rights:												
a. Agreement	12	33	8	20	10	16	12	17	5	10	9	16
b. Policy	3	8	10	24	14	22	13	18	12	25	11	19
c. Neither	21	58	23	56	40	62	47	65	32	65	37	65
15. NEA Code of Ethics:												
a. Agreement	4	11	3	7	2	3	7	10	2	4	5	9
b. Policy	0	0	4	10	3	5	6	8	6	13	4	7
c. Neither	32	89	34	83	59	92	59	82	40	83	48	84

TABLE N-4

Language

Northern Area

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	Cook & DuPage		Kish		Lake		North-west		Starved Rock		Three Rivers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
In your written agreement or board policy, the following clauses are included:												
1. Recognition (Agree to meet with organized teacher group):												
a. Agreement	100	74	25	83	24	67	22	63	17	65	21	57
b. Policy	12	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
c. Neither	23	17	5	17	12	33	13	37	9	35	16	43
2. Procedures (who, when, where, etc.)												
a. Agreement	93	69	19	63	16	44	13	37	11	42	14	34
b. Policy	6	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
c. Neither	36	27	11	37	20	56	22	63	15	58	27	66
3. Scope (limits items considered):												
a. Agreement	84	63	18	60	15	42	14	40	8	31	11	27
b. Policy	7	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
c. Neither	43	32	12	40	21	58	21	60	18	69	30	73

Table N-4 -- Continued

	Cook & DuPage		Kish.		Lake		North-west		Starved Rock		Three Rivers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
(Clauses in your policy or agreement - continued)												
4. Impasse Procedure:												
a. Mediation only	28	21	5	17	9	25	3	9	6	23	4	10
b. Factfinding only	7	5	1	3	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0
c. Both	34	25	7	23	6	17	3	9	1	4	3	7
d. Other	6	4	2	7	2	6	3	9	3	12	5	12
e. None	59	44	15	50	19	53	24	69	16	62	29	71
5. Grievance Procedure:												
a. Yes, to board only ..	58	43	16	53	13	36	6	17	5	19	8	20
b. Arbitration	46	34	5	17	5	14	7	20	4	15	6	15
c. None	30	22	9	30	18	50	22	63	17	65	26	65
6. Class Size:												
a. Agreement	27	20	6	20	3	8	3	9	1	4	4	10
b. Policy	22	16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
c. Neither	85	63	24	80	33	92	32	91	25	96	36	90
7. School Calendar:												
a. Agreement	29	22	5	17	8	22	4	11	2	8	9	22
b. Policy, teacher input.	33	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
c. Neither	73	54	24	83	28	78	31	89	24	92	32	78

Table N-4 -- Continued

	Cook & DuPage		Kish.		Lake		North-west		Starved Rock		Three Rivers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
The following terms can be found in your written agreement or policy:												
8. Good Faith:												
a. Agreement	75	56	13	43	15	43	13	37	11	42	14	34
b. Policy	8	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
c. Neither	51	38	17	57	20	57	22	63	15	58	27	66
9. Matters of Mutual Concern:												
a. Agreement	58	43	13	43	9	25	6	17	7	27	12	29
b. Policy	11	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
c. Neither	67	49	17	57	27	75	29	83	19	73	29	71
10. Just Cause:												
a. Agreement	29	22	2	7	3	8	4	11	2	8	5	12
b. Policy	11	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
c. Neither	95	70	28	93	33	92	31	89	24	92	36	88
11. Academic Freedom:												
a. Agreement	32	24	2	7	8	22	3	9	3	12	4	10
b. Policy	24	18	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
c. Neither	79	58	28	93	28	78	32	91	22	88	37	90
12. Evaluation Procedures:												
a. Agreement	52	38	7	23	14	39	10	29	5	19	8	20
b. Policy	47	34	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
c. Neither	38	28	23	77	22	61	25	71	21	81	33	80

Table N-4 -- Continued

	Cook & DuPage		Kish.		Lake		North-west		Starved Rock		Three Rivers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
(Terms found in your policy or agreement - continued)												
13. Maintenance of Standards:												
a. Agreement	20	15	2	71	5	14	3	9	0	0	6	15
b. Policy	26	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
c. Neither	89	66	27	90	31	86	32	91	26	100	35	85
14. Association and Teacher Rights:												
a. Agreement	68	50	6	20	10	28	8	23	7	27	7	17
b. Policy	18	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
c. Neither	49	36	24	80	26	72	27	77	19	73	34	83
15. NEA Code of Ethics:												
a. Agreement	12	9	4	13	2	6	2	6	1	4	2	5
b. Policy	12	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
c. Neither	111	82	26	87	34	94	33	94	25	96	39	95

5. PROCEDURES

Table 5 -- State Totals: Page 48
Table S-5 -- Southern Area: Page 50
Table N-5 -- Northern Area: Page 52

Items relating to procedures are designed to profile the persons who are doing actual negotiating in Illinois in terms of their experience, training, and assistance used.

Results: There is an obvious relationship between the presence of written agreements and the degree of training and help given to local teachers by their state organization. From the respondents without a signed agreement, 73 percent of the districts indicated that their teachers were getting some help in collective bargaining from the teacher organizations. Statewide, approximately 80 percent were receiving some sort of assistance. In those districts with written agreements, 93 percent were receiving help; in the Chicago area, 84 percent received help from the teacher organization. The major distinction, an obvious one, is that in the districts with signed written agreements, 26 percent of the districts found the teacher organization providing help at the table or were present during the bargaining process--only 6 percent of the districts without written agreement had seen the teacher organization agent during bargaining. It appears that the state teacher organization is providing considerable assistance to the local teacher organization for the purpose of bargaining with the board of education.

Item two, the membership of the board team, shows that the majority of the districts (63 percent) include board members and administrators at the table. Less than 20 percent in any category include only board members on the bargaining team, and about half that amount have only school administrators doing the collective bargaining. It appears that bargaining with the teacher organization is a joint responsibility of the board and the administrative staff. The use of an attorney or consultant on the board team appears in less than 5 percent of the districts without written agreements and in only 5 percent of the districts outside of the Chicago area. But in those districts reporting a signed written agreement, 15 percent include an attorney on the team; in the Chicago area, 20 percent included an attorney or consultant on the team. It would appear that the presence of a written agreement has encouraged management to employ a collective bargaining expert at the table.

Item three, the role of the superintendent, suggests that in a majority of cases (approximately 75 percent overall), the superintendent recognizes his role as being either on the board team or as a consultant to the board. In only a very few cases is the superintendent not involved at all. A central question is, when does the superintendent move from being consultant to either party to joining the board's bargaining team?

In districts without signed agreements, 34 percent of the superintendents serve as a consultant to both parties. With written agreements, only 22 percent serve this role. The implication is that the presence of the written agreement has forced the superintendent to "choose sides" and join the board team.

The board attorney, item four, is of service in bargaining in about 50 percent of the districts statewide. Twenty-seven percent of the districts with signed agreements and 42 percent of districts without signed agreements said that the board attorney is not experienced in negotiations and is not used. The exception is in the Chicago area, where only 18 percent said that the board attorney is not experienced in collective bargaining. This would suggest that more school attorneys in the Chicago area have a background in labor relations or that there is wider selection of school attorneys there. Downstate, 40 percent of the districts do not have any attorney with experience in the bargaining process. Of the districts with written agreements, less than 15 percent use the board attorney as a member of the bargaining team.

In terms of training received by the board team, items five through eight, it appears that a majority of the board negotiators statewide have received training at IASB workshops. Even in the districts without written agreements, 71 percent of the board teams (or a member of the team) have received help in these workshops. If there is a signed written agreement, then there is a greater tendency for the board team to receive training from sources other than IASB workshops. In the Chicago area, 52 percent of the responding districts have used other training programs. Statewide, 43 percent of the districts with signed agreements have received training in other workshop programs. The board team has received help from consultants in 40 percent of the cases where there is a signed written agreement, and between 20 and 30 percent in cases without a written agreement. In the Chicago area there is a significantly higher percentage that have received help from consultants other than the IASB staff compared to the rest of the state.

Discussion: It seems that the teacher organizations have readily made available training programs and help to the local teacher organizations. Even in nonbargaining areas, three-fourths of the school districts are aware of help given to the teacher bargainers or local teachers associations by their parent organization. The board teams are also receiving assistance. This assistance, for the most part, seems to be in attendance at workshops and/or other training programs. The use of consultants appears to occur least in the downstate districts and in districts without written agreements. This may suggest that the future could be of concern to those districts which have not received training and consulting help if, indeed, the teacher organization is currently getting assistance in collective bargaining. The point at which teachers can produce the pressures necessary to force the board into a bargaining relationship may well come before the board is ready for such a relationship.

In terms of the makeup of the team and the utilization of the attorney and superintendent in the district, it would seem that the superintendent's role changes with the presence of formal collective bargaining, suggesting that he can no longer act as the "educational leader" to both the board and the teachers at that point, but must begin siding with the board of education. There would also appear to be a greater tendency for bargaining boards, particularly in the Chicago area, to use an attorney or consultant on the team in bargaining with teachers. The greater percentage of attorneys acting as consultants in the Chicago area and the greater percentage of attorneys with experience in bargaining in the Chicago area, would imply a richer resource of legal help to boards in these particular areas. This also seems to imply a problem for the future in the downstate areas where a significant percentage of respondents said their attorneys are not used in bargaining and that their attorneys have no experience in bargaining. Only a small percentage that do not use their attorneys in bargaining indicate that he does have the experience necessary to help them in bargaining. If we add those that use the attorney only for approval of language or whenever he is needed, one can only guess that the help available to these districts is minimal. Confronted with a tough bargaining situation, boards in these areas would be forced to turn elsewhere for help.

TABLE 5

Procedures

State Totals

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	State Totals						State Less Chicago Area		Chicago	
	Signed Agmnt		No Agmnt		All					
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Teacher organization has provided teachers with:										
a. Training programs only	9	3	14	5	23	4	23	5	0	0
b. Training and consulting help	70	25	52	17	126	20	101	21	25	18
c. (b) plus assistance.	73	26	17	6	92	15	51	11	40	29
d. Some help	106	38	136	45	251	41	202	42	49	36
e. No assistance	20	7	81	27	122	20	100	21	22	16
2. The board's team has:										
a. Board members and administrators	160	57	197	70	368	63	298	66	69	53
b. Board members only	53	19	50	18	106	18	88	20	18	14
c. Administration only	26	9	26	9	56	10	39	9	17	13
d. Attorney or consultant	42	15	7	3	52	9	21	5	26	20
3. Superintendent Role:										
a. On board team	82	29	88	31	177	30	141	30	35	26
b. Board spokesman	39	14	39	14	85	14	65	14	20	15
c. Board consultant	91	32	53	18	150	25	107	23	43	32
d. Consultant to either party	61	22	99	34	169	28	139	30	30	26
e. Not involved	8	3	8	3	17	3	12	3	5	4
4. Board attorney is:										
a. Team member	33	12	6	2	40	7	18	4	22	17
b. "On call"	101	37	110	42	226	40	183	42	42	32
c. Used for langauge approval only	41	15	9	3	52	9	29	7	23	17
d. Not used in negotiations--no experience.	73	27	111	42	193	34	169	39	24	18
e. Not used--has negotiations experience	22	8	29	11	53	9	32	7	21	16

Table 5 (Continued)

	State Totals						State Less Chicago Area		Chicago Area	
	Signed Agmnt		No Agmnt		All					
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
The board team has received help from:										
5. IASB Workshops:										
a. Yes	233	84	226	71	478	76	378	76	100	75
b. No	43	16	93	29	154	24	120	24	33	25
6. Other Training Programs:										
a. Yes	115	43	86	28	210	34	143	30	67	52
b. No	154	57	223	72	402	66	339	70	62	48
7. IASB Staff:										
a. Yes	109	40	92	30	207	34	168	35	39	30
b. No	161	60	216	70	404	66	314	65	89	70
8. Other Consultants:										
a. Yes	108	40	65	21	182	30	111	23	71	55
b. No	161	60	238	79	423	70	363	77	59	45

TABLE S-5

Procedures

Southern Area

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	South-Western		Black-hawk & Western		Corn Belt & CIV		Abe Linc. & Illini		2 Rivers & Kaskaskia		Wabash, Egyptian, Shawnee	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Teacher organization has provided teachers with:												
a. Training programs only	1	3	1	2	1	2	1	1	3	6	4	7
b. Training and consulting help	6	17	6	15	10	15	11	15	6	13	10	17
c. (b) plus assistance .	2	6	4	10	4	6	6	8	3	6	10	17
d. Some help	17	44	21	51	34	52	43	60	22	46	23	40
e. No assistance	9	26	9	22	16	25	11	15	14	29	11	19
2. The board's team has:												
a. Board members and administrators	25	71	27	73	43	66	39	60	36	80	37	76
b. Board members only ..	5	14	5	14	13	20	19	29	5	11	3	6
c. Administration only .	5	14	3	8	6	9	5	8	3	7	4	8
d. Attorney or consultant	0	0	2	5	3	5	2	3	1	2	5	10
3. Superintendent Role:												
a. On board team	12	35	12	32	17	26	17	25	21	45	17	32
b. Board spokesman	5	15	4	10	11	17	10	15	2	4	14	26
c. Board consultant	12	35	10	26	16	25	15	22	6	13	10	19
d. Consultant to either party	5	15	12	32	21	32	23	34	18	38	10	19
e. Not involved	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	2	4

Table S-5 -- Continued

	South-Western		Black-hawk & Western		Corn Belt & CIV		Abe Linc. & Illini		2 Rivers & Kaskaskia		Wabash, Egyptian, Shawnee	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
4. Board attorney is:												
a. Team member	2	6	1	3	1	2	0	0	1	2	4	8
b. "On call"	14	42	16	44	20	32	19	28	24	49	24	46
c. Used for language approval only	3	9	1	3	3	5	5	8	3	6	0	0
d. Not used in negotiations--no experience.	12	35	14	39	33	52	33	49	16	33	20	38
e. Not used--has negotiations experience ...	3	9	4	11	6	9	10	15	5	10	4	8
The board team has received help from:												
5. IASB Workshops:												
a. Yes	31	89	35	81	56	78	52	70	40	76	45	73
b. No.....	4	11	8	19	16	22	22	30	13	24	17	27
6. Other Training Programs:												
a. Yes	16	46	19	48	25	36	25	36	17	32	20	36
b. No.....	19	54	21	52	44	64	45	64	36	68	36	64
7. IASB Staff:												
a. Yes	10	28	18	45	26	38	30	42	19	37	30	54
b. No	26	72	22	55	42	62	42	58	32	63	26	46
8. Other Consultants:												
a. Yes	10	29	13	32	13	19	18	26	12	24	20	38
b. No	25	71	27	68	54	81	51	74	39	76	33	62

TABLE N-5

Procedures

Northern Area

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	Cook & DuPage		Kish.		Lake		North-west		Starved Rock		Three Rivers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Teacher organization has provided teachers with:												
a. Training programs only	0	0	3	10	1	3	4	12	2	8	2	6
b. Training and consulting help	25	18	8	27	7	22	16	48	11	44	9	26
c. (b) plus assistance .	40	29	7	23	6	19	1	3	3	12	4	12
d. Some help	49	36	9	30	8	25	9	27	4	16	11	32
e. No assistance	22	16	3	10	10	31	3	9	5	20	8	23
2. The board's team has:												
a. Board members and administrators	69	53	15	52	14	48	19	59	18	72	22	61
b. Board members only ..	18	14	8	28	9	31	11	34	5	20	5	14
c. Administration only .	17	13	2	7	1	3	2	6	1	4	7	19
d. Attorney or consultant	26	20	2	7	5	17	0	0	1	4	2	6
3. Superintendent Role:												
a. On board team	35	26	7	24	6	21	11	32	10	38	9	24
b. Board spokesman	20	15	2	7	1	3	6	18	2	8	7	19
c. Board consultant	43	32	12	41	9	31	7	21	3	12	6	16
d. Consultant to either party	30	26	5	17	11	38	10	29	10	38	14	38
e. Not involved	5	4	3	10	2	7	0	0	1	4	1	3

52

Table N-5 -- Continued

	Cook & DuPage		Kish.		Lake		North-west		Starved Rock		Three Rivers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
4. Board attorney is:												
a. Team member	22	17	3	12	3	13	0	0	1	4	2	6
b. "On call"	42	32	13	52	9	39	11	42	12	54	19	61
c. Used for language approval only	23	17	2	8	4	17	5	19	0	0	3	10
d. Not used in negotiations--no experience.	24	18	7	28	7	30	10	38	9	41	7	23
e. Not used--has negotiations experience	21	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
The board team has received help from:												
5. IASB Workshops:												
a. Yes	100	75	25	83	16	55	29	85	20	83	25	68
b. No	33	25	5	17	13	45	5	15	4	17	12	32
6. Other Training Programs:												
a. Yes	67	52	7	23	4	14	3	9	1	4	4	11
b. No	62	48	23	77	25	86	31	91	24	96	33	89
7. IASB Staff:												
a. Yes	39	30	8	27	1	3	8	24	9	36	6	16
b. No	89	70	22	73	28	97	26	76	16	64	31	84
8. Other Consultants:												
a. Yes	71	55	5	17	4	14	6	18	3	12	5	14
b. No	59	45	25	83	25	86	28	82	22	88	32	86

6. EVALUATION OF IASB SERVICES

Table 6 -- State Totals: Page 55
Table S-6 -- Southern Area: Page 56
Table N-6 -- Northern Area: Page 58

IASB has, in the past few years, provided a number of services to school districts in the area of collective bargaining. The intent of this section was to determine whether these services have been used; if they have been used, have they been helpful; if not used, might they be used in the future if the need arises.

Results and Discussion: The data would indicate that the salary settlement survey service was used by a significant number of districts. Approximately 75 percent have used the salary settlement survey service and consider it helpful. Those who have not used it said they would consider using it if they needed assistance. The negotiations workshops and the bargaining bulletin both were used and were helpful to over half of the districts. About 40 percent of the districts said that they have not used it but might in the future.

The Level IV analysis was used by approximately 40 percent of the districts overall and by half of the districts in the Chicago area. This suggests that its use is more common in districts that are involved in collective bargaining than in those that are not; the remainder, for the mose part, have not used it but might in the future.

About 40 percent of the districts statewide have used IASB consultants and rated them as helpful. The remainder would use them in the future, although they have not done so to date. It is interesting to note that in the Chicago area a smaller percentage of districts have used IASB staff consultants than have districts downstate. This may be due to the fact that the Chicago area districts were confronted with collective bargaining problems prior to the availability of staff consultation from IASB.

In summary, it appears that IASB services are evaluated highly in the area of collective bargaining, but that they are being used by only those districts who consider that they presently have bargaining problems. This, again, presents a concern: If these services are not used at least for training in and a sensitivity to the process, many school districts may be ill-prepared to handle the pressures of bargaining when their time comes.

TABLE 6

Evaluation of IASB Services

State Totals

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	State Totals						State Less Chicago Area		Chicago Area	
	Signed Agmnt		No. Agmnt		All					
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Salary Settlement Survey:										
a. Used, helpful	-	-	-	-	460	73	361	74	99	71
b. Not used, might use in the future	-	-	-	-	151	24	117	23	34	24
c. Used, not helpful ...	-	-	-	-	22	3	15	3	7	5
2. Level IV Analysis:										
a. Used, helpful	-	-	-	-	230	40	157	36	73	54
b. Not used, might use in the future	-	-	-	-	326	57	265	61	61	45
c. Used, not helpful ...	-	-	-	-	18	3	16	3	2	1
3. IASB Negotiations Workshops:										
a. Used, helpful	-	-	-	-	352	57	273	57	79	57
b. Not used, might use in the future	-	-	-	-	255	41	196	40	59	42
c. Used, not helpful ...	-	-	-	-	14	2	13	3	1	1
4. Bargaining Bulletin:										
a. Used, helpful	-	-	-	-	351	59	257	57	94	68
b. Not used, might use in the future	-	-	-	-	226	38	182	40	44	32
c. Used, not helpful ...	-	-	-	-	16	3	15	3	1	1
5. IASB Staff Consultation:										
a. Used, helpful	-	-	-	-	233	39	195	43	38	27
b. Not used, might use in the future	-	-	-	-	352	60	251	56	101	73
c. Used, not helpful ...	-	-	-	-	4	1	4	1	0	0

TABLE S-6

Evaluation of IASB Services

Southern Area

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	South-Western		Black-hawk & Western		Corn Belt & CIV		Abe Linc. & Illini		2 Rivers & Kaskaskia		Wabash, Egyptian, Shawnee	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Salary Settlement Survey:												
a. Used, helpful	31	82	30	61	53	67	58	72	42	78	46	68
b. Not used, might use in the future	7	18	18	37	23	29	22	28	11	20	22	32
c. Used, not helpful	0	0	1	2	3	4	0	0	1	2	0	0
2. Level IV Analysis:												
a. Used, helpful	18	47	13	27	22	28	20	26	13	25	21	32
b. Not used, might use in the future	19	50	35	73	55	70	58	74	39	75	43	65
c. Used, not helpful	1	3	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	3
3. IASB Negotiations Work-shops:												
a. Used, helpful	27	71	24	49	39	49	37	46	31	56	29	43
b. Not used, might use in the future	11	29	25	51	38	48	44	54	24	44	39	57
c. Used, not helpful	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table S-6 -- Continued

	South-Western		Black-hawk & Western		Corn Belt & CIV		Abe Linc. & Illini		2 Rivers & Kaskaskia		Wabash, Egyptian Shawnee	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
4. Bargaining Bulletin:												
a. Used, helpful	27	71	31	63	40	51	45	56	27	50	33	50
b. Not used, might use in the future	11	29	18	37	37	47	35	43	27	50	32	48
c. Used, not helpful	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	2
5. IASB Staff Consultation:												
a. Used, helpful	9	24	20	41	31	40	33	41	23	42	34	50
b. Not used, might use in the future	29	76	29	59	45	58	47	59	32	58	34	50
c. Used, not helpful	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE N-6

Evaluation of IASB Services

Northern Area

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	Cook & DuPage		Kish.		Lake		North-west		Starved Rock		Three Rivers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Salary Settlement Survey:												
a. Used, helpful	99	71	23	82	19	79	21	75	19	86	19	83
b. Not used, might use in the future	34	24	4	14	3	12	3	11	2	9	2	9
c. Used, not helpful ...	7	5	1	4	2	8	4	14	1	4	2	9
2. Level IV Analysis:												
a. Used, helpful	73	54	13	81	11	69	10	59	6	46	10	67
b. Not used, might use in the future	61	45	2	13	3	19	6	35	3	23	2	13
c. Used, not helpful ...	2	1	1	6	2	12	1	6	4	31	3	20
3. IASB Negotiations Workshops:												
a. Used, helpful	79	57	17	74	15	71	20	74	18	95	16	73
b. Not used, might use in the future	59	42	3	13	3	14	3	11	1	5	5	23
c. Used, not helpful ...	1	1	3	13	3	14	4	15	0	0	1	4
4. Bargaining Bulletin:												
a. Used, helpful	94	68	13	62	12	71	10	48	10	77	9	56
b. Not used, might use in the future	44	32	6	29	4	23	5	24	2	15	5	31
c. Used, not helpful ...	1	1	2	9	1	6	6	29	1	8	2	13

Table N-6 -- Continued

	Cook & DuPage		Kish.		Lake		North-west		Starved Rock		Three Rivers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
5. IASB Staff Consultation:												
a. Used, helpful	38	27	11	69	3	30	10	56	12	75	9	39
b. Not used, might use in the future	101	73	5	31	7	70	7	39	4	25	13	56
c. Used, not helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	1	4

7. THE FUTURE

Table 7 -- State Totals: Page 63
Table S-7 -- Southern Area: Page 66
Table N-7 -- Northern Area: Page 68

This section attempts to analyze what local districts would do if a collective bargaining law were passed by the legislature. It seeks to determine where they would seek help, what they could afford to pay, and who would be most qualified to act as their spokesman.

Results: Items one through five present five possible sources of assistance in collective bargaining and ask whether help would be sought in some manner from any or all of those sources. The results indicate that districts would seek assistance from any agent or agency offering such service, ranging from 90 percent statewide who would contact IASB, to 33 percent who would seek assistance from the Illinois Office of Public Instruction. These seems to be no significant differences in any category with the exception that in the Chicago area and among those with written agreements, a greater percentage indicated that help would be sought from a negotiations attorney rather than a local attorney. The other responses indicated the opposite.

Item six asks which source would be first consulted by the district for assistance and which should more directly evaluate the respondent's current attitude toward the services provided by each of them. In the state overall, the IASB and the local attorney would be sought by 43 percent and 36 percent of the districts, respectively. Labor attorneys would be consulted first by 15 percent of the districts. In downstate districts, IASB would be consulted first by 54 percent, while local attorneys and labor attorneys would be consulted first by 32 percent and 7 percent, respectively. Other agencies, the IASA and OSPI, would be sought first in very few cases, probably reflecting the lack of any management assistance programming provided by these groups.

Of significance is that in the bargaining districts, the Chicago area and those with signed agreements, 40 to 45 percent rate the local attorney as the first source of help, a negotiations attorney second with 29-35 percent, while IASB ranks third with 24 percent. Only 15 percent of the Chicago area districts would seek IASB first. Comparing these findings with the downstate and nonbargaining statistics, it is noteworthy that the ratings are reversed. That is, IASB would be used to a greater extent than either of the two types of attorneys.

In terms of what a district could afford, item seven, the data indicate that those districts that have bargained place a higher value upon the cost of bargaining, or may have a greater reality of what is entailed in bargaining. This is suggested by the fact that 33 percent of the

districts with written agreements and 45 percent of the Chicago area districts would spend $4,000 or more for bargaining, and only about 30 percent would budget less than $1,000. The nonbargaining areas, however, place a lower priority, have fewer dollars available, or have a lack of understanding of the costs of bargaining. Only 11 percent of the nonbargaining districts would budget $4,000 or more and 59 percent would budget less than $1,000. Overall, about 20 percent of the districts would budget $4,000 or more and about 50 percent would budget less than $1,000.

In terms of who is most qualified in the district to act as the spokesman if a collective bargaining law is passed, it is interesting to note that in spite of the fact that the superintendent (see Table 6) was listed as the spokesman a very low percentage of the time, he is the most qualified in terms of understanding the bargaining process in all kinds of districts--those with or without agreements, whether downstate or near Chicago. Board members in bargaining districts would be used by 19 percent of the districts, whereas in the nonbargaining areas, only 8 percent feel that a board member is most qualified--signifying either that in bargaining districts board members have become trained or that in bargaining areas board members are more apt to have some experience in the process of collective bargaining.

The most significant finding is that 63 percent of the bargaining districts believe they have a qualified spokesman available in the district; in the nonbargaining areas, only 46 percent of the districts would have someone considered to be qualified as a spokesman in collective bargaining.

Discussion: It appears that if bargaining is mandated in Illinois, districts will turn to any available source for assistance--ranging from the 30 percent that would seek help from the OSPI to the more than 90 percent who would seek help from IASB. The nature of the help desired is not clear from the data, but it appears that those districts which have not bargained, which have not formalized the process and trained team members, but which are able to afford an attorney, would probably seek help either from IASB, from their local attorney, or from both. If the data in Table 5 is accurate in indicating that many local attorneys are not qualified in collective bargaining, this places a great responsibility on IASB for those districts which are not now in formal bargaining, particularly for those outside the Chicago area. It suggests that the supply of consultant help in the Chicago area is much greater, at least as evaluated by the respondents, than in the rest of the state.

The spokesman most frequently available would appear to be a superintendent or another administrator in larger school districts, which may suggest that the responsibility for IASB would be in training administrators and local attorneys in the process of collective bargaining. The other agencies would not be selected as the major source of help, probably reflecting the fact that they do not presently provide this sort of service to school districts.

The anticipated budgeting for bargaining also brings forth potential problems. Those districts which have negotiated realize that the cost of bargaining is significant, either with or without outside consultants. This is reflected in the fact that the bargaining districts and Chicago area districts would budget more realistically. (This may also reflect the fact that they are the larger districts with larger budgets and might be able to afford more for bargaining assistance.) More than half of the districts without written agreements say they can afford less than $1,000, and 20 percent say they can afford nothing. This means that those districts, if we exclude internal costs of bargaining (such as administrative time, contract management, etc.), would have to be provided with training and consultation at a very minimal cost. Even if pressure by the teachers should create a need and release more money in the budget for collective bargaining, the potential for employing an attorney at the table is almost negligible in those particular low budget districts. The concern of these districts then would be for assistance other than at the table--assistance which could provide them with enough expertise and enough training to struggle through the process on their own by training somebody locally.

TABLE 7

The Future

State Totals

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	State Totals						State Less Chicago Area		Chicago Area	
	Signed Agmnt		No Agmnt		All					
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
If a state law mandated bargaining, from whom would you seek help?										
1. Local Attorney:										
a. Yes	144	53	228	65	403	60	309	58	93	66
b. No	128	47	121	35	269	40	222	42	47	34
2. Negotiations Attorney:										
a. Yes	141	55	125	40	283	46	190	39	93	71
b. No	115	45	188	60	328	54	290	60	38	29
3. IASB:										
a. Yes	230	85	330	93	606	90	492	91	113	84
b. No	39	14	24	7	68	10	47	9	21	16
4. IASA:										
a. Yes	157	60	272	78	468	71	380	72	87	66
b. No	105	40	75	22	190	29	147	28	43	33

Table 7 -- Continued

	State Totals						State Less Chicago Area		Chicago Area	
	Signed Agmnt		No Agmnt		All					
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
(Source of help - continued)										
5. OSPI:										
a. Yes	59	22	110	33	186	29	159	31	27	21
b. No	201	77	225	67	459	71	357	69	101	78
6. From whom would you first seek assistance:										
a. Local Attorney .	79	40	84	30	183	36	121	32	61	45
b. Negotiations Attorney	57	29	13	5	76	15	28	7	48	35
c. IASB	47	24	162	58	224	43	203	54	21	15
d. IASA	7	4	6	2	15	3	14	4	1	1
e. OSPI	1	1	4	1	5	1	5	1	0	0
f. Other	4	2	9	3	13	2	8	2	5	4
7. If a law were passed, what could you afford to budget for outside help per year?										
a. $6000 or more ..	56	21	24	7	81	12	36	7	45	33
b. $4000-6000	31	12	14	4	47	7	31	6	16	12
c. $2000-4000	44	17	34	10	85	13	65	12	19	14
d. $1000-2000	55	21	70	20	137	21	121	23	16	12
e. Less $1000	43	16	134	38	197	30	176	33	21	16
f. Nothing	36	14	73	21	118	18	100	19	18	13

Table 7 -- Continued

	State Totals						State Less Chicago Area		Chicago Area	
	Signed Agmnt		No Agmnt		All					
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
(Source of help - continued)										
8. If a law were passed, who is the most qualified to act as spokesman for your board team?										
a. Board Member	52	19	28	8	82	12	61	11	20	15
b. Supt.	84	31	129	36	233	34	197	36	36	27
c. Another administrator	37	14	7	2	45	7	31	6	14	11

TABLE S-7

The Future

Southern Area

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	South-Western		Black-hawk & Western		Corn Belt & CIV		Abe Linc. & Illini		2 Rivers & Kaskaskia		Wabash, Egyptian, Shawnee	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
If a state law mandated bargaining, from whom would you seek help?												
1. Local Attorney:												
a. Yes	22	56	30	62	51	66	60	75	41	63	43	67
b. No	17	44	18	38	26	34	20	25	15	27	21	33
2. Negotiations Attorney:												
a. Yes	14	42	25	60	26	39	31	44	14	31	36	61
b. No	19	58	17	40	41	61	39	56	30	67	23	39
3. IASB:												
a. Yes	37	97	50	98	75	96	79	96	54	96	63	93
b. No	1	3	1	2	3	4	3	4	2	4	4	6
4. IASA:												
a. Yes	34	92	43	90	67	89	69	85	50	91	55	83
b. No	3	8	5	10	8	11	12	15	5	9	11	17
5. OSPI:												
a. Yes	15	43	16	32	28	39	26	33	25	48	34	51
b. No	20	57	34	68	43	61	52	67	25	48	33	49

Table S-7 -- Continued

	South-Western		Black-hawk & Western		Corn Belt & CIV		Abe Linc. & Illini		2 Rivers & Kaskaskia		Wabash, Egyptian, Shawnee	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
6. From whom would you first seek assistance?												
a. Local Attorney	14	39	12	24	21	27	27	32	18	32	26	39
b. Negotiations Attorney .	4	11	8	16	5	6	3	4	2	4	6	9
c. IASB	13	36	28	55	46	59	49	58	30	54	33	49
d. IASA	4	11	2	4	5	6	1	1	1	2	1	1
e. OSPI	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	1	1
f. Other	1	3	1	2	1	1	3	4	2	4	0	0
7. If a law were passed, what could you afford to budget for outside help per year?												
a. $6000 or more	4	12	4	8	5	7	7	8	1	2	3	4
b. $4000-6000	2	6	3	6	1	1	6	7	1	2	2	3
c. $2000-4000	3	9	3	6	14	18	6	7	6	11	10	15
d. $1000-2000	10	29	9	18	17	22	17	20	15	28	12	18
e. Less $1000	7	21	18	36	24	32	28	33	19	35	26	39
f. Nothing	8	23	13	26	15	20	20	24	12	22	14	21
8. If a law were passed, who is the most qualified to act as spokesman for your board team?												
a. Board Member	9	24	5	10	8	10	5	6	7	13	7	10
b. Superintendent	19	51	24	47	34	43	28	33	15	27	24	35
c. Another administrator...	5	14	3	6	6	8	6	7	1	2	1	2

TABLE N-7

The Future

Northern Area

Responses to each item are expressed as a percentage of those responding to the item.

	Cook & DuPage		Kish.		Lake		North-west		Starved Rock		Three Rivers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
If a state law mandated bargaining, from whom would you seek help?												
1. Local Attorney:												
a. Yes	93	66	6	21	13	41	13	39	5	19	19	48
b. No	47	34	23	79	19	59	20	61	21	81	21	52
2. Negotiations Attorney:												
a. Yes	93	71	5	17	11	[illegible]	8	24	11	42	7	18
b. No	38	29	24	80	21	66	25	76	15	58	33	82
3. IASB:												
a. Yes	113	84	27	90	22	69	26	79	21	81	31	78
b. No	21	16	2	7	10	31	7	21	5	19	9	22
4. IASA:												
a. Yes	87	66	9	30	9	28	14	42	8	31	17	42
b. No	43	33	20	67	23	72	19	58	18	69	23	58
5. OSPI:												
a. Yes	27	21	2	7	4	12	6	18	3	12	5	14
b. No	101	78	27	90	28	88	28	82	22	88	32	86

Table N-7 -- Continued

	Cook & DuPage		Kish.		Lake		North-west		Starved Rock		Three Rivers	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
6. From whom would you first seek assistance?												
a. Local Attorney	61	45	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
b. Negotiations Attorney	48	35	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
c. IASB	21	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
d. IASA	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
e. OSPI	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
f. Other	5	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
7. If a law were passed, what could you afford to budget for outside help per year?												
a. $6000 or more	45	33	4	13	2	6	3	9	1	4	2	6
b. $4000-6000	16	12	5	17	3	9	2	6	3	12	3	9
c. $2000-4000	19	14	4	13	7	20	1	3	4	16	5	14
d. $1000-2000	16	12	9	30	5	14	9	28	10	40	6	17
e. Less $1000	21	16	6	20	14	40	10	31	6	24	15	43
f. Nothing	18	13	2	7	4	11	7	22	1	4	4	11
8. If a law were passed, who is the most qualified to act as spokesman for your board team?												
a. Board member	20	15	4	13	5	14	2	6	5	21	4	10
b. Superintendent	36	27	7	23	12	34	16	48	6	25	10	25
c. Another administrator ..	14	11	3	10	1	3	1	3	1	4	2	5

8. PRIORITIES FOR PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

Table 8 -- State Totals: Page 74
Table S-8 -- Southern Area: Page 76
Table N-8 -- Northern Area: Page 78

In this section, seven different kinds of programs, ranging from inservice programs to providing experienced negotiators, were listed for the respondents to rank in the order in which they would be of benefit to their districts. Because of the nature of the data, three determinations were made:

a) The number of respondents who rated that particular type of program as the first priority, or most important.

b) The average rank from one to seven for a given category or area.

c) The direction of the response.

The direction of the response is of importance because of the diversity of the responses and the effect this diversity would have upon the average rank. For instance, "providing negotiators" consistently ranked low on the average because the respondents had a tendency to rate this service as either very high or very low. Hence, the average rank was generally low. L indicates a low, that is, a relative direction of the response toward low ratings; H is relative toward high; and I, or indefinite, suggests that the opinions were scattered from high to low, with no particular direction.

Results: Item one is an inservice training program for staff and administrators. This program was ranked third highest by districts with no collective bargaining agreements and seventh (last) by those with signed agreements and by those in the Chicago area. The average rank was fifth. However, in the statewide totals, 110 respondents rated this program as first priority, which places it third highest in number of top rankings--second only to providing negotiators and local workshops. It would appear that districts not confronted with formal bargaining retained some hope of being able, through inservice training, to sensitize the staff to the pitfalls and problems associated with formal bargaining.

Item two, indistrict meetings--small group--with adminstrators, board, and teacher leadership, consistently rated low. It rated highest in the districts without written agreements and rated next to lowest in the districts with signed agreements. Overall, it rated next to last, suggesting a total response similar to that for inservice programs (item one).

Item three, indistrict training for board and administration only, rated much higher and was the first suggested program not involving teacher organization leadership or staff. This particular program rated higher in nonbargaining districts and in statewide totals than in either the Chicago area or those with signed agreements, although it ranked third on an average in districts with signed agreements and fourth in the districts in the Chicago area. Its overall rating was high and it was either ranked high or indefinite. In no case was the direction of response low.

Item four, the local workshop programs for negotiators, in all cases received an average rank of one and a high direction of responses. In statewide totals it received 125 first priority rankings, the second highest number of such rankings.

Item five, one-day workshops for the negotiating team, consistently rated high. It rated lowest in the districts without written agreements and in the downstate area, but even there its average rank was third to fifth.

Item six, two to four-day intensive training workshops, rated surprisingly low with the exception of the Chicago area where it was overall ranked third. In the downstate and withour agreement categories, it was next to last, ranking sixth. Statewide, it ranked fourth and had a direction of response to the low side.

Item seven, providing experienced negotiators, ranked consistently low on an average except among districts with signed agreements and those in the Chicago area, where it ranked fifth. However, in all cases, its direction of response was indefinite, because although it averaged low, it consistently had a high number of first priority rankings. Overall in the state, it received the highest number of first priority responses--131 compared to 125 for local workshops. Even though it ranked consistently low, it is a service that would be considered beneficial to a large number of districts. Its low ranking might be attributed to the fact that if the bargainers and/or spokesmen were already available to a district, then this service, obviously, would not be one which would receive a high priority.

Discussion: It seems that the most valuable services which could be provided for training at the local level would be in the area of local workshops, one-day workshops, or in providing negotiators for school districts. Local workshops consistently ranked high, one-day workshops consistently ranked second or third, and the direction of response in these cases was consistently high. The service of providing a negotiator ranked high in terms of number of first choices and should be something considered for those districts who do not have a collective bargaining spokesman presently available.

Programs for a complete school district, including faculty, seemed to be favored only in those districts that do not have written agreements.

In these districts there may be some reason for hoping that training or exposure to collective bargaining might discourage the staff from getting into a sophisticated process. Even those districts saying that this was still possible preferred a program for all the staff and not just with the teacher leadership. This suggests that the teacher leadership is not the key in terms of local training, but that the rank and file teacher might benefit most from some sort of sensitivity training. Of particular concern to IASB would be the two to four-day intensive training workshops, since these have been used in the past and are rated fairly high by those districts with written agreements and who have previously attended them, but they are not rated as high as the local workshops and the one-day workshops.

When one considers the experience and training needed for intensive bargaining purposes, it appears that the respondents--even those previously involved in bargaining--do not feel the need for the intensive training. This may be an error in judgment which could have a far-reaching and negative impact on management in the future, particularly if Illinois gets a law that mandates bargaining.

TABLE 8

Priorities for Collective Bargaining Programs and Services

State Totals

Items in this table are evaluated by comparative rating rather than by numbers and percentages.

	State Totals									State Less Chicago Area			Chicago Area		
	Signed Agmnt			No Agmnt			All								
	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD
If a law is passed, which of the bargaining programs listed below would be of value to your district?															
1. Inservice program for staff and administrators ...	24	7	L	77	3	H	110	5	I	93	4	I	17	7	L
2. In-district, small group meetings with board, administrators, and teacher leadership	22	6	L	53	4	I	82	6	L	70	5	I	12	6	L

(a)= The number of respondents who ranked the item as their first priority.

(b)= The rank order of items 1 to 7 based on the mean score of all items.

(c)= Response Direction is indicated as follows:
H (high response) means that most responses were first, second, or third priority;
L (low response) means that most responses were fifth, sixth, or seventh.

Table 8 -- Continued

	State Totals									State Less Chicago Area			Chicago Area		
	Signed Agmnt			No Agmnt			All								
	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Pank 1-7	(c) RD
(Value of programs - continued)															
3. In-district training for board and administration only	30	3	I	49	2	H	89	2	H	74	2	H	14	4	I
4. Local workshops for supt. and/or board negotiators	59	1	H	49	1	H	125	1	H	105	1	H	20	1	H
5. 1-day workshops for negotiating team	30	2	H	16	5	I	49	3	H	38	3	I	11	2	H
6. 2 to 4-day intensive training workshops	43	4	I	27	6	L	77	4	L	52	6	L	25	3	I
7. Providing experienced negotiators to bargain for your board at reasonable cost ..	53	5	I	71	7	I	131	7	I	94	7	I	37	5	I

TABLE S-8

Priorities for Collective Bargaining Programs and Services

Items in this table are evaluated by comparative rating rather than by numbers and percentages.

	South-Western			Black-hawk & Western			Corn Belt & CIV			Abe Linc. & Illini			2 Rivers & Kaskaskia			Wabash, Egyptian, Shawnee		
	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD
If a law is passed, which of the bargaining programs listed below would be of value to your district?																		
1. Inservice program for staff and administrators ...	3	6	L	9	3	1	17	4	1	15	3	1	13	3	1	11	3	1
2. In-district, small group meetings with board, administrators, and teacher leadership	1	5	1	8	5	1	7	6	L	11	5	1	11	4	1	4	6	L

(a)= The number of respondents who ranked the item as their first priority.

(b)= The rank order of items 1 to 7 based on the mean score of all items.

(c)= Response Direction is indicated as follows:
H (high response) means that most responses were first, second, or third priority;
L (low response) means that most responses were fifth, sixth, or seventh;

Table S-8 -- Continued

	South-Western			Black-hawk & Western			Corn Belt & CIV			Abe Linc. & Illini			2 Rivers & Kaskaskia			Wabash, Egyptian, Shawnee		
	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD
(Value of programs - Continued)																		
3. In-district training for board and administration only	5	3	H	4	2	H	11	2	H	12	2	H	7	2	1	14	2	H
4. Local workshops for supt. and/or board negotiators	11	1	H	8	1	H	15	1	H	15	1	H	9	1	H	12	1	H
5. 1-day workshops for negotiating team	7	2	H	2	6	1	9	3	H	3	4	1	3	5	1	3	4	1
6. 2 to 4 day intensive training workshops	7	4	1	3	3	1	11	5	1	13	6	L	6	6	L	4	7	1
7. Providing experienced negotiators to bargain for your board at reasonable cost ...	2	7	L	15	7	1	9	7	L	13	7	1	8	7	1	15	5	1

TABLE N-8

Priorities for Collective Bargaining Programs and Services

Items in this table are evaluated by comparative rating rather than by numbers and percentages.

	Cook & DuPage			Kishwaukee			Lake			Northwest			Starved Rock			Three Rivers		
	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD
If a law is passed, which of the bargaining programs listed below would be of value to your district?																		
1. Inservice program for staff and administrators ...	17	7	L	4	5	L	6	2	I	3	5	I	4	6	L	7	4	I
2. In-district, small group meetings with board, administrators, and teacher leadership	12	6	L	6	4	I	5	5	I	5	4	I	4	7	L	5	3	I

(a)= The number of respondents who ranked the item as their first priority.

(b)= The rank order of items 1 to 7 based on the mean score of all items.

(c)= Response Direction is indicated as follows:
H (high response) means that most responses were first, second, or third priority;
L (low response) means that most responses were fifth, sixth, or seventh;
I (indefinite) means there was no discernible direction to the responses.

Table N-8 -- Continued

	Cook & DuPage			Kishwaukee			Lake			Northwest			Starved Rock			Three Rivers		
	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD	(a) Top Rank	(b) Rank 1-7	(c) RD
(Value of programs - Continued)																		
3. In-district training for board and administration only	14	4	I	6	2	H	4	3	H	3	2	H	2	3	H	5	2	H
4. Local workshops for supt. and/or board negotiators	20	1	H	5	1	H	7	1	H	12	1	H	4	1	H	7	1	H
5. 1-day workshops for negotiating team	11	2	H	3	3	I	4	4	I	1	3	I	1	2	H	2	6	I
6. 2 to 4-day intensive training workshops	25	3	I	0	7	L	1	6	L	2	6	L	3	4	I	2	7	L
7. Providing experienced negotiators to bargain for your board at reasonable cost ..	37	5	I	7	6	I	5	7	I	4	7	L	7	5	I	7	5	I

IMPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC POLICY AND SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

Results of this study have some obvious implications for organizations which, like IASB, have some responsibility for helping school management meet new challenges. The help that school districts need to deal with collective bargaining will multiply many times over if mandatory bargaining becomes a reality.

For public policy makers at both the state and local levels, further implications emerge when one examines the data in the larger context of:

- The increasingly political nature of education;
- The expanding science of school management.

Implications for Public Policy

Clearly, there is bargaining going on in Illinois school districts. Of the 702 respondents in this study, 282 report that they have signed agreements with their teacher organizations. Only 49 districts--a meager 7 percent--report that they do not meet with their teachers at all. The preponderance of districts, therefore--some 53 percent--deal directly with their teachers in a whole continuum of formal to informal kinds of relationships. In those districts where no signed agreements are negotiated, teachers are more likely to have a voice in professional and educational policy matters than their counterparts in bargaining districts. While 52 percent of the nonbargaining districts are willing to discuss "any item" with their teachers, 66 percent of the bargaining districts limit the scope of discussion. Apparently, the spectre of a legally enforceable contract narrows down the topics that some school boards view as "negotiable."

Those responsible for public policy in education might ask themselves: Is this situation healthy or unhealthy? Is a state-mandated format for bargaining preferable to a format tailored jointly by the local school board, administration, and teachers?

The study further reveals that teachers in bargaining districts enjoy few economic benefits that their counterparts in nonbargaining districts don't enjoy to the same extent. Bargaining has little or no impact among districts reporting average and above average salaries.

If teachers do not stand to gain materially from collective bargaining, what then are the most likely results of a mandatory collective bargaining law? Who will benefit?

The data suggest the following results of a mandatory bargaining law:

1. The percentage of teacher organization membership in each district and the number of local teacher organizations affiliated with state organizations will increase. More local teacher groups will receive increased assistance from their state organizations. When the level of dues-paying members among a district's faculty reaches 50 percent, the state teacher organization will move in with greater assistance for its local affiliate. Then:

   a) The school board will grant recognition to the majority organization (as required by proposed laws);

   b) More and more teachers will join their lawfully designated bargaining organization;

   c) The level of dues-paying members will climb rapidly toward 100 percent, financing even more staff assistance from the state organization.

2. There will be an increase in the legal language and the clauses under which management will have to operate. This will result in increased management costs, drawing criticism of public school administration from various political spokesmen.

3. The designated educational leader, the superintendent, often will be replaced as spokesman for the board in dealing with the teacher organization.

4. School boards will turn more to outside assistance and will expend more funds for legal fees, again drawing criticism from various political and teacher organization spokesmen. However, smaller districts with smaller budgets may find it impossible to provide the funds necessary to cope with the bargaining process.

5. More school boards will reduce the scope of communications with their teachers in an effort to limit the impact of bargaining on their policy-making role.

On the basis of these conclusions, one might reasonably point to three beneficiaries of a mandatory collective bargaining law:

1. The teacher organizations stand to benefit the most, particularly at the state and national levels and particularly the Illinois Education Association. Although the IEA is progressively organizing more and more school districts, the process is a gradual one. A mandatory law will sharply reduce the time required to fully organize teachers in Illinois, thereby facilitating the work of the organization. By the same token, the data indicates that the IEA has progressed to the point where its apparent advantage over the Illinois Federation of Teachers would be magnified by a mandatory law.

2. The Illinois Association of School Boards and other organizations representing school management will find their services in much greater demand. In fact, as more and more school boards confront the complex problems associated with bargaining, these organizations will have to introduce a whole array of new services. It is probably reasonable to assume that the larger school districts which are already engaged in bargaining are better equipped internally to cope with their needs than are the smaller districts that will have to cope once a bargaining law is enacted.

3. The relatively new field of public sector labor relations, dominated at present largely by attorneys, will expand dramatically. This has several implications for public policy. For one thing, large sums of public funds are being spent to acquire expert assistance in bargaining. Expertise in this field is scarce and its price is high. For another thing, expanded need will spread available talent even thinner, driving up the prices and inviting the less competent to jump in for a piece of the action. Much study is needed to determine the extent of public school funds flowing to attorneys and other consultants as a result of bargaining, contract administration, the processing of grievances, appeals to the courts, and the involvement of various regulatory agencies. At the same time, the public and its policy makers must be made to understand that neither lay school board members nor school administrators are trained to function in these highly technical areas. The true cost of providing collective bargaining for teachers must be determined--and then that cost must be provided for. If either the State Legislature or the U.S. Congress should legislate mandatory bargaining, the law ought to include an appropriation to underwrite attendant costs.

Implications for School Management

Increased salary costs under collective bargaining are subject to roughly the same limitations as those without bargaining. Revenue available for salary increases is limited to a fixed combination of local and state funding, particularly in districts which are at or near their maximum approved tax rates. Salaries already account for an average of 85 percent of Education Fund expenditures, leaving little room to absorb further increases through reallocations within the budget. Expenditures for instructional materials and supplies can be cut only so much. This "fixed budget" of the schools may account for the fact that teacher salaries, in this study, prove to be no better in bargaining districts than in nonbargaining districts. Earlier studies have shown that collective bargaining has not materially altered the percentage of school revenue devoted to teacher salaries on a statewide average. ("How School Districts Spend Their Money," 1971, IASB.) A frequent recommendation from affiliates of the Illinois Education Association is to generate additional funds for teacher salaries by cutting administrative and non-certificated staffs.

School budgets, of course, will have to provide for the cost of conducting bargaining and the legal fees that result from disputes over contract interpretation and the processing of formal grievances. Further study is needed in this area, but this study indicates that most districts greatly underestimate the costs involved. Limited studies on this subject place the cost of conducting bargaining at $6,000 to $30,000 a year (not including contract administration).

Clearly, the impact of mandatory bargaining falls more heavily on management's ability to manage than it does on the salary budget.

In districts not now bargaining formally, boards and administrators can expect mandatory bargaining to generate a much more formal and adversarial relationship with their teachers. Most managements probably will attempt to reduce the range of topics discussed with teachers, although for 34 percent of the respondents in this study, such attempts apparently were not successful.

Teachers, rather, will place much greater dependence upon their organizations, not only for their livelihoods and job security, but for professional involvement and input to educational policy. Signed agreements go hand in hand with massive organizational involvement in school district affairs and with management "by the contract." Board-teacher relations will be reduced to legal language.

Managements which presently deal informally with their teachers are able to obtain faculty input on a wide range of policy matters without fear of abrogating their public responsibilities. Where signed agreements are introduced, it appears that the fear of delegating public policy to private interests causes management to reduce the range of communications, if it can.

However, judging from the various clauses and legal terms related to job security, hiring, assignment, dismissals, and the like, it appears that bargaining districts are accepting numerous restrictions on management's ability to manage. It is ironic that these restrictions come at a time when the public is demanding more effective management. It is even more ironic that the public officials who are most vocal in supporting this demand are frequently the same ones who support mandatory collective bargaining.

FOR ADDITIONAL COPIES

A limited supply of this report (Status of Collective Bargaining in Illinois Schools, 1973-74) are available at $4.00 each for members of IASB and $5.00 each for non-members. Quantity discounts, applicable to both member and non-member prices, are:

Three to five copies -- 10 percent
Six to ten copies -- 15 percent
Eleven or more copies -- 20 percent

Return the coupon below with check payable to: Illinois Association of School Boards, 330 Iles Park Place, Springfield, Illinois 62718.

Payment must accompany all orders under $10.00.

Please send me _____ copies of Status of Collective Bargaining in Illinois Schools, 1973-74 at the: ___ member price of $4.00 each, or the ___ non-member price of $5.00 each, less any applicable quantity discount:

☐ 10 percent (3 to 5 copies)
☐ 15 percent (6 to 10 copies)
☐ 20 percent (11 or more copies)

___ Enclosed is a check or money order in the amount of $_____.

___ Bill me in the amount of $_____.

Name_____ Title_____

Institution _____

Street _____ Phone_____

City, State, Zip Code _____